Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Division

Section

Number

S228
S225

Baptist pamphlets. 54.

Williams Doct. D. Tho. Lahee
Birmingamensis Natus 3° 1753.

PÆDO-BAPTISM

DEFENDED, &c.

PÆDO-BAPTISM DEFENDED:

OR, THE

ANTIQUITY

OF

INFANT-BAPTISM FURTHER MAINTAINED.

In ANSWER to

DR. GILL'S REPLY,

ENTITLED,

ANTIPÆDO-BAPTISM, &c.

John Brekell

Parvulos baptizandos esse, concedunt, qui contra auctoritatem universæ Ecclesiæ *proculdubio* per Dominum et Apostolos traditam, venire non possunt.
Augustin. de Peccator. Merit. et Remiss. lib. 1. *cap.* 26.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WAUGH, at the *Turk's-Head* in *Lombard-Street.* M.DCC.LIV.

ERRATA in PÆDO-BAPTISM.

PAGE 8. line 24, 25. for *Believer's Baptiſm diſplayed*, read baptiſm diſcovered. Page 59. in the Notes, line 8. for Levit. read Luc. Page 92. line 8. read *Bardeſanes*.

PÆDO-BAPTISM

DEFENDED, &c.

IF Infant-baptiſm ſhould paſs for an *innovation*, or ſuch a late and novel invention, as its oppoſers pretend it to be, this might *prejudice* them, and others, againſt any argument that might be offered in ſupport of its *authority*. Therefore, to prepare the way for proving its authority, it was judged a proper ſtep, in the firſt place, to diſcuſs the point of its *antiquity*. And ſo, this was the deſign of the tract, entitled *Pædo-baptiſm*, which Dr. *Gill* has honoured with his remarks, beginning where it ends, and inverting the order of the whole argument.

Towards the cloſe of *Pædo-baptiſm* [*a*] are theſe words: "Thus, from the begin-" ing of the fifth *century* backward, either " expreſsly, or in reſpect to the common

[*a*] Page 93.

" *grounds* of it, (thoſe very grounds, upon " which, the *Antipædo-baptiſts* themſelves " ſay, it was founded) we have traced up " the practice of Infant-baptiſm to the " time of the Apoſtles". — Now, theſe *grounds* were the ſuppoſed *neceſſity* of baptiſm to ſalvation, either as a mean of *cleanſing from ſin*, particularly *original* ſin, or of gaining *admittance into the kingdom of God.* Theſe are acknowledged to be the commonly received grounds of Infant-baptiſm in the *primitive* church; whether right, or wrong, was no queſtion with the author, who was only enquiring into the *matter of fact:* For, as he adds, " it is only the *fact* " itſelf, as atteſted by the antient *writers*, " not their *reaſonings* about it, in which " we are concerned at preſent". —— Says Mr. *Stennet*, [*b*] (one of the moſt ingenious and learned writers on that ſide) " The opi- " nion of the abſolute neceſſity of baptiſm " to ſalvation, from a miſunderſtanding of " thoſe words of Chriſt, *Except a Man be* " *born of water*, &c. Joh. iii. 5. ſeems to " have introduced Infant-baptiſm into the " Chriſtian Church." But, with ſubmiſſion, as it does not appear that the *antients* miſunderſtood thoſe words of Chriſt, by underſtanding them of *baptiſm*; ſo, it follows not, that *Infant-baptiſm* was introduced into the Chriſtian Church upon any *miſtake*,

[*b*] Anſwer to *Ruſſen*, p. 77.

miſtake, merely becauſe a wrong notion of baptiſm was taken up; *ſuppoſing* that to have been the caſe. For, people might very eaſily take up ſuch a notion, *after* they had received Infant-baptiſm, and though they received it as a divine inſtitution. When any of the philoſophers (e. g. *Plato)* made uſe of weak arguments to prove the *immortality* of the *ſoul*, it ſeems to be a juſt obſervation, that they muſt have received that doctrine *before:* otherwiſe they could not have been induced, upon ſuch ſlight, inſufficient *grounds*, to embrace it at all [*c*]. In like manner, if wrong notions, and weak reaſons, of baptiſm in general, or of Infant-baptiſm in particular, prevailed in the *primitive* church, it is eaſy to conceive, that the thing itſelf was in uſe, before any ſuch inſufficient grounds of it were aſſigned. And thus, according to this view of the caſe, the practice of Infant-baptiſm was not *introduced*, (as is imagined) or originally grounded upon thoſe reaſons; but thoſe reaſons were grounded and grafted upon the practice of Infant-baptiſm, already received in the Chriſtian Church. This being premiſed, let us now attend to Dr. *Gill*'s remarks upon Pædo-baptiſm.

Mr. *Bingham* (a name of ſo much note for learning and ſkill in eccleſiaſtical mat-

 ters,

[*c*] See *Haliburton*'s Inſufficiency of Nat. Relig. ch. 14. p. 45.

ters, that, if it ſhould not ſecure a perſon from error, it might very well ſcreen him from *contempt* with all men of candour) was quoted [*d*] for *this* remark; "The "moſt antient writer, that we have, is *Cle-* "*mens Romanus*, who lived in the time of "the Apoſtles; and he, though he doth "not expreſsly mention Infant-baptiſm, "yet ſays a thing, that by *conſequence* "proves it: For, he makes Infants liable "to Original Sin, which in effect is to ſay, "that they have need of baptiſm, *&c.*" [*e*]. The paſſage to which Mr. *Bingham* refers, is a quotation from *Job* xiv. 4, 5. which, according to the *Greek* verſion, *Clemens* reads thus: *No man is free from pollution, no not tho' his life is but of one day.* But, Dr. *Wall* obſerves [*f*], that in the next chapter *Clemens* brings in, to the ſame purpoſe, the ſaying of *David*, *Pſ.* li. 5. *I was ſhapen in iniquity*, &c.—Now, Dr. *Gill* takes notice of the former paſſage, but ſays not a word of the latter, paſſing over it to *another*, mentioned by Dr. *Wall*. And all that he has to urge, with reference to the paſſage in *Job*, is, that "it might be brought "to prove Original Sin, but is not brought "by *Clemens* for any ſuch purpoſe" [*g*]. However, it is as much brought in for ſuch a purpoſe,

[*d*] Pædo-baptiſm, p. 92.
[*e*] Antiq. of the Chr. Ch. B. 11. Ch. 4. S. 6.
[*f*] Hiſt. of Inf. Bapt. P. 1. Ch. 1.
[*g*] Antipædo-baptiſm, p. 5.

a purpoſe, as the ſaying of *David*; and, as both theſe paſſages are commonly alledged by the primitive writers in proof of Original Sin, ſo, it is preſumed, Dr. *Gill* himſelf ſuppoſes, that *Clemens* alſo underſtood them in the ſame light; therefore, he cannot fairly deny, that in this *apoſtolical* father we may trace *one* of the received *grounds* of Infant-baptiſm in the primitive church, when he remembers his own account of *Auſtin*'s ſaying, "*This the* church "has *always* had, has *always* held." For, ſays he [*b*], "it was the doctrine of Ori-"ginal Sin, and the Baptiſm of Infants for "the remiſſion of it, he ſpeaks of." And indeed, of all men, one cannot but wonder moſt at *thoſe*, that hold Original Sin, and yet diſown Infant-baptiſm; that look upon all infants as *loſt* in *Adam*, and left deſtitute, at the ſame time, of any appointed *ſign*, or token of their concern with Chriſt, under the *cleareſt revelation*, and the brighteſt diſplay, of redeeming love and grace. But, that any ſuch perſons exiſted in the *primitive* church, does not appear. It is to no purpoſe then, for the Doctor, to alledge *any* ſuch in *our* days, unleſs he had produced ſome inſtances of this kind in the *earlier* ages of the church, and particularly in the time of *Clemens Romanus*.

The

[*b*] Argum. from Ap. Trad. p. 26.

The ſame learned *Bingham* was alſo cited [*i*] for *this* obſervation, " *Hermas Paſ-*
" *tor* lived about the ſame time with *Cle-*
" *mens*, and hath ſeveral paſſages to ſhew
" the general *neceſſity* of water, that is, *Bap-*
" *tiſm*, to ſave men." Now, ſays the Dr. [*k*] " ſurely he could not mean real ma-
" terial water, *&c.*" and yet, he does not pretend to know, what *Hermas* does mean. But, whatever the true meaning be, the words plainly *allude*, at leaſt, to Baptiſm, and that as neceſſary to ſalvation: for, there is no accounting for his way of ſpeaking upon any other ſuppoſition, when that author expreſſes himſelf thus [*l*]: " Hear
" therefore, why the tower is built upon
" the water: becauſe your life is, and
" ſhall be *ſaved by water*". And again, [*m*] " before a man receives the name of
" the Son of God, he is ordained unto
" death; but when he receives the ſeal,
" he is freed from death, and delivered un-
" to life. Now, *that ſeal is water*, into
" which men go down under the obliga-
" tion of death, but come up appointed
" unto life" [*n*]. Therefore, we have here the *general ground* and foundation of Infant-baptiſm, as received in the primitive church, either clearly expreſſed, or plainly referred

[*i*] Ibid. [*k*] Antipædo, p. 6.
[*l*] Lib. 1. Viſion 3. Sect. 3.
[*m*] Lib. 3. Simil. 9. S. 16.
[*n*] See *Wall*'s Defence, p. 237. *&c.*

referred to, *viz.* the *neceſſity* of Baptiſm to life and ſalvation. And this is all that *Hermas Paſtor* was cited for.

Now, ſays Dr. *Gill* [*o*], " our author " upon the above paſſages concludes after " this manner; " Thus—we have traced " up the *practice* of Infant-baptiſm to the " time of the Apoſtles;" when thoſe wri- " ters give not the leaſt hint of Infant- " baptiſm, or have any reference to it, or " the practice of it;" and then adds, " It " is amazing what a *face* ſome men have!" which is really very true; otherwiſe, how could the doctor deal ſo unfairly, as to quote the author's words imperfectly, by leaving out the *alternative*, viz. " *either ex-* " *preſsly*, or *in reſpect* to the *common grounds* " of it." Beſides, he has removed the words out of their proper place; for, they came in as they were cited above, upon a review of the *connected* evidence for Infant-baptiſm, from the beginning of the fifth century, backward to the firſt ages of all. " In all which period, (as it is added) " [*p*] the Antipædo-baptiſts cannot produce " one ſingle author to diſprove the fact." Nor has Dr. *Gill* himſelf yet produced any ſuch author, as will appear by the ſequel. Therefore, the *preponderating* evidence, whether more or leſs, does ſtill lie on the ſide of Infant-baptiſm. It is true, the

[*o*] Pag. 7. [*p*] Pædo baptiſm, p. 94.

the teſtimonies from *Clemens Romanus*, and *Hermas Paſtor*, are not direct and expreſs proofs, nor are they alledged as ſuch, but only as proving Infant-baptiſm by *conſequence*; (even upon the principles of its oppoſers, by pointing out the acknowledged *grounds* of it in the primitive church). It was thus that the argument was ſtated, in the words of the learned *Bingham*; and the Doctor, if he pleaſes, may wonder at *his* face: But, as Dr. *Wall* obſerves [*q*], "Proofs by conſequence for any *affirmative*, "do give *that* the advantage againſt a *negative*, of which there are no proofs at all."

Dr. *Gill* ſays [*r*], "nothing out of *Barnabas*, *Polycarp*, and *Ignatius*, in favour "of Infant-baptiſm, is pretended to." But, if that had been thought neceſſary, or conſiſtent with ſtudied brevity, the ſame *grounds* of Infant-baptiſm might have been pointed out in theſe writers alſo. *Ignatius* mentions *Original Sin* [*s*], as the learned *Voſſius* underſtands his words [*t*]. And *Barnabas* ſpeaks more than once of the uſe and efficacy of Baptiſm to *cleanſe* from ſin [*u*]. As for *Polycarp*, I do not find, upon a curſory review, that he ſays any thing of Baptiſm at all. And this alſo (to note that by the way) is the caſe with ſome other antient writers,

[*q*] Defence, p. 281. [*r*] Pag. 4, 5.
[*s*] Ep. ad Trallian.
[*t*] Hiſt. Pelag. lib. 2. P. 1. Th. 6. [*u*] Sect. 11.

writers, that are ſometimes mentioned, as having nothing in favour of Infant-baptiſm: [x] but their ſcheme might therefore be as *pertinently*, and properly alledged, to diſprove *all* baptiſm in the ſame period.—— But, ſpeaking of *Barnabas* and *Hermas* upon another occaſion [y], the Doctor obſerves, " the learned Mr. *Stennet* [z] has " cited ſome paſſages out of them, and af- " ter him Mr. *David Rees* [a], which are " manifeſt proofs of Adult-baptiſm, and " that as performed by immerſion." And what *Pædo-baptiſt* doubts of either? The only queſtion is, whether Adult-baptiſm was the *only* Baptiſm, and immerſion the only *mode* of baptiſm? As to the *latter*, we ſhall ſay no more of it at preſent: but, in relation to the *former*, it is acknowledged, that Adult-baptiſms were very frequent and common in the *firſt*, and ſome following ages, by reaſon of the great number of *new* converts to the Chriſtian faith. But this concludes nothing at all againſt Infant-baptiſm; becauſe, as plain *inſtances*, and as clear deſcriptions, of Adult-baptiſm may be produced from thoſe very writers who were Pædo-baptiſts themſelves, and lived at that time when Pædo-baptiſm prevailed, by the confeſſion of it's moſt ſanguine oppoſers;

C

[x] Divine Right of Inf. Bap. p. 22.
[y] Ibid. p. 20. [z] Anſ. to *Ruſſen*, p. 142, 143.
[a] Anſwer to *Walker*, p. 157.

posers; as will be shewn in a proper place. At present I must observe, that Mr. *Stennet*, and Mr. *Rees*, as referred to by Dr. *Gill* himself, understood the words of ~~Baptism~~, which have been considered, of *Baptism*, and consequently as spoken of *real material water*; though the Doctor would now shuffle them off to something else, he knows not what. *Before*, they were *manifest proofs* of Adult-baptism, *&c.* but now the Doctor can properly see no Baptism at all in them, no *real material water*, something *mystical* must surely be designed; and what it is, he leaves to those who better understand these visionary things! Thus Doctors differ! And thus can the same Doctor differ from himself! understand the same passages different ways; or *affect* not to understand them at all, just as it serves a present turn; and still *keep his countenance!* Proceed we now with him to

The second century.

Of the *Recognitions*, says Mr. *Bingham*, [*b*] "it is an antient writing of the same "age with *Justin Martyr*, mentioned by "*Origen* in his *Philocalia*, and by some "ascribed to *Bardesanes Syrus*, who lived "about the middle of the second century. "This author speaks of the *necessity* of "Baptism,

[*b*] Ubi supra, Sect. 8.

" Baptiſm, in the ſame ſtile, as *Juſtin* " *Martyr* did, *&c.*" [*c*]. Dr. *Gill* here replies, with ſome warmth, ſaying [*d*], " whenever this wretched tenet, this falſe " notion of the abſolute neceſſity of Bap- " tiſm to ſalvation is met with, the *Pæ-* " *do-baptiſts* preſently ſmell out Infant- " baptiſm, *&c.*" And why ſhould they not? when the *Antipædo-baptiſts* themſelves have lent us their noſes, to ſmell it out? But ſome people have a wonderful faculty, and a ſtrange command over their ſenſes. (happy for them, and others, if they had the ſame over their paſſions!) They can *underſtand*, or not underſtand; *ſmell*, or not ſmell, juſt as it ſuits their preſent occaſion; otherwiſe, what imaginable reaſon can be aſſigned, why thoſe, who believed the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm to ſalvation, ſhould defer one moment, to adminiſter it to Infants, at leaſt in caſe of danger?—In reſpect to the notion itſelf, whether it was true, or falſe, is not the queſtion; but whether ſuch a notion did really obtain in the moſt primitive times: and that it actually did, we have ſeen before in *Barnabas* and *Hermas*. Therefore this is none of the *dotages* peculiar to the *Recognitions*; nor was *Bardeſanes Syrus*, (if he was the author, and the contrary is not proved) ever charged wirh hereſy for hold-

[*c*] See Pædo-bap. p. 92. [*d*] Antipædo, p. 9.

ing this *tenet:* ſo that all, the Doctor ſuggeſts upon this head, is nothing to the purpoſe.——But, he has one ſalvo yet; he ſays, "the myſtery of iniquity worked by "degrees, *&c.*" which is very true, in reſpect to the general corruption of religion: but, if by the *myſtery of iniquity* he means *Infant baptiſm*, we deny his ſuppoſition, and deſpiſe the calumny. However, "true "it is, (as he ſays) that one error leads on "to another;" and this may account for the introduction of *Antipædo-baptiſm*, which upon enquiry will be found to be a *myſtery*, which worked by very *ſlow* degrees. I ſhall only add, *Bardeſanes Syrus* was a writer of great note; as appears from *Jerome*'s account [*e*]: *Euſebius* has given us a large extract from ſome of his writings [*f*]; and if he *was not wholly free from hereſy*, even to the laſt, Dr. *Gill* ſhould not bear too hard upon him on that account, for the ſake of his favourite author, *Tertullian*. But, if *Antipædo-baptiſm* may be upheld; *no matter* by what weak arguments it is ſupported.

Paſs we on now to *Juſtin Martyr*, from whom a paſſage was alledged [*g*], to confront the Doctor's aſſertion [*b*], (ſpeaking of the time of *Irenæus*, junior to *Juſtin*) *viz.* "that

[*e*] Catalog. de Script. Eccleſ.
[*f*] De Praep. Evangel. lib. 6. num. 10.
[*g*] Pædo-baptiſm, p. 84.
[*b*] Argum. from Apoſt. Trad. p. 14.

" that it had not as yet obtained among the " antients to uſe the words, *regenerated*, " and *regeneration*, for *baptized*, and Bap- " tiſm." The paſſage is this; " We bring " them (*i. e.* the *new converts*) to ſome place, " where there is water, and they are regene- " rated by the ſame way of regeneration, by " which we were regenerated: for they " are waſhed with water in the name of " God, the Father, *&c.* becauſe Chriſt " ſays [*i*], unleſs you be regenerated, you " cannot enter into the kingdom of hea- " ven, *&c.*" [*k*]. Obſerve now, (1.) *Juſtin* ſays of the *new converts*, (*after* they were made ſuch) " we bring them to ſome place, " where there is water, and they are *rege-* " *nerated*, &c." (2.) In proof hereof he adds, " *for* they are waſhed with water, " *&c.*" Thus he deſcribes the *way* of regeneration. And then, (3.) he aſſigns the *reaſon* of this practice: " For, or becauſe, " Chriſt ſays, Unleſs you be regenerated, *&c.*" Can any thing in the world be plainer; than that *Juſtin* here uſes the term, *regenerati-on*, and alſo underſtands thoſe words of Chriſt, of *baptiſm?* How then could Dr. *Gill* have the *face* to ſay [*l*], " that the per- " ſons *Juſtin* ſpeaks of are not repreſented " by him as regenerated *by* baptiſm!" and who can but wonder at the reaſon he gives

[*i*] Joh. iii. 3. 5. [*k*] Apol. 2.
[*l*] Antipædo, p. 11.

for it? *viz.* " becauſe they are ſpoken of " before, as converted perſons, and belie- " vers!" Before what? why, before they are ſpoken of as regenerated by Baptiſm; therefore, they were not regenerated by baptiſm! excellent logic! This is the *ſtrong*, and *nervous* reaſoning of the *Antipædo-baptiſt!* In vain would the Doctor avail himſelf here of the *modern* uſe of the word *regeneration*, as implying the ſame thing with *converſion:* but that word had no ſuch uſe among the *antients*, without a reference to Baptiſm [*m*]. In vain alſo would he burleſque the ſenſe given of *Juſtin*'s words, by pretending, that it makes him ſay, " they were baptized, becauſe they " were baptized." — For, the preſent queſtion is not about the *thing*, but the uſe of the *word*, regeneration. And we do not ſay, that regeneration, and baptiſm, are *identically* the ſame; but that the former word is ſo uſed, as to *connote* baptiſm, and refer to it, *viz.* as the *way*, and mean of regeneration. So ſays *Juſtin*, " we bring " them to the water, and they are rege- " nerated by the ſame *way* of regeneration, " by which we were regenerated; *for* " they are waſhed with water, *&c.*" — When Dr. *Gale* had quibbled upon the words of *Juſtin Martyr*, in the ſame manner, as his brother *Doctor* now doth; Dr *Wall*

[*m*] *Wall*'s Hiſt. P. 1. ch. 2.

Wall ſaid [*n*], " I muſt declare, and I do " it in cold blood, I never met with any " one of ſo finiſhed effrontery, to deny " things, that are plain, and viſible." — In ſhort: *Juſtin* puts the very ſame conſtruction upon our Saviour's words, *Joh.* iii. 3. 5. as the author of the *Recognitions* did [*o*]: therefore " that then no ſuch conſtructi- " on of the words obtained, that baptiſm is " neceſſary to ſalvation," is a groundleſs pretence, and a manifeſt error. —— Before we diſmiſs this paſſage, it is proper to conſider, what Dr. *Gill* has ſuggeſted from it, (after Dr. *Gale)* in disfavour of Infant-baptiſm. It is very plain, that *Juſtin* is ſpeaking of *new* converts from *heatheniſm*; and it is allowed, on all ſides, that ſuch perſons muſt be baptized at adult-age. But this makes nothing againſt Infant-baptiſm. However, let us hear what is offered upon this head. It is alledged [*p*], that " if Infant-baptiſm " had been practiſed in thoſe days, it is " not conſiſtent with that ſincerity, which " *Juſtin* ſets out with, when he propoſed " to give the *Roman* Emperor an account of " Chriſtian Baptiſm, not to make any men- " tion of it, *&c.*"—To which I reply, there was no inſincerity, or unfair dealing in the caſe, if *Juſtin* ſaid ſo much of baptiſm, and the other Chriſtian rites, as was ſufficient,

[*n*] Defence, p. 325.
[*o*] Lib. 6. num. 9.
[*p*] Antipædo, p. 10.

ent, to anſwer the Emperor's expectation, and the proper deſign of writing his *apology*; which was to ſhew, that the Chriſtians were not ſuch vile, and ſeditious perſons, as their enemies repreſented them, but worthy men, and good ſubjects, and that there was nothing in their religion, which had a tendency to make them otherwiſe. It was therefore quite impertinent for *Juſtin* to ſay any thing of infants; who could lie under no ſuſpicions of that kind [*q*]. Beſides, as the *Romans* had a ſolemn form of luſtration for infants [*r*], the *Roman* Emperor, without being told of it, might naturally conclude the ſame of the Chriſtians.——It is further urged from the ſame quarter, that, "he had occaſion to ſpeak of it—had it "been uſed; ſince the Chriſtians were "charged with uſing their infants barbar-"ouſly, *&c.*" But this is a *far-fetched imagination*; as Dr. *Wall* properly enough calls it [*s*]: beſides, *that* calumny, among others, *Juſtin* refutes in another part of his *apology*; and ſo had no occaſion to recur to it again [*t*]. To which let me add, if, as theſe writers are wont to contend, *immerſion* was the only *mode* of baptiſm; had *Juſtin* told the Emperor, that they *plunged* their infants, this might rather have confirmed, than

[*q*] See *Cobbet*'s Juſt Vindication, P. 3. ch. 4. p. 1.
[*r*] Vid. Macrob. Saturn, lib. 1. c. 16.
[*s*] Ibid. p. 275. [*t*] P. 70. E. Colon.

than removed the ſuſpicion of *uſing them barbarouſly*: and for my part, I cannot conceive, how ſuch a notion ſhould get among the *Heathens* concerning the Chriſtians, if their Infants had nothing to do with their *ſacred rites*.——In reply to what is further recited from *Juſtin Martyr*, after Dr. *Gale*; it will be ſufficient for me, if I tranſcribe Dr. *Wall*'s anſwer, (of which Dr. *Gill* takes not the leaſt notice; an endleſs way of writing controverſy!) [*u*] "what he obſerves of "*Juſtin*'s ſaying, that our firſt generation "is without our *knowledge*, or choice; but "that a *heathen man* (for of ſuch he there "ſpeaks) comes to this Baptiſm (which is "his *regeneration*, or ſecond birth) of his "*own will* and choice; is no more than he "would have ſaid of any *proſelytes*, entring "into God's covenant by circumciſion, "(which the *Jews*, as I ſhewed, did alſo "call regeneration). The adult proſelyte "did partake of this regeneration by his "own choice. This is no proof, but that "his Infant-children had the ſame circumciſion, and regeneration, by their parent's "dedicating them, and God's gracious acceptance."

In his *Dialogue* with *Trypho* the Jew, it was obſerved [*w*] there is a paſſage, "where "*Juſtin Martyr* ſays, *that* concerning the "influence and effect of *Adam*'s ſin upon

D mankind,

[*u*] Defence, p. 276. [*w*] Pædo-Bap. p. 85.

" mankind, which the antient writers re-
" preſent as the ground and reaſon of In-
" fant-baptiſm." " Now (ſays Dr. *Gill*) [*x*]
" allowing that this is ſpoken of Original
" Sin, as it ſeems to be, what is this to In-
" fant-baptiſm?"—To which I anſwer, if Original Sin is any thing to Infants; why ſhould not the words of *Juſtin* make for Infant-baptiſm, when the antient writers repreſent the former, as the ground and reaſon of the latter? But ſays the Doctor, " I
" have already expoſed the folly of arguing
" from perſons holding the one, to the prac-
" tice of the other."— Has he ſo indeed! But how? Why, by telling us of ſome *moderns* that hold Original Sin without practiſing Infant-baptiſm! And could not I tell him of many others, that both hold the one, and practiſe the other? But, *what is this to the antients?* And let it be remembered, that it is not the *reaſon* of the thing, much leſs any *modern* opinions about it, but the ſenſe of the *antients* concerning the matter in queſtion, which is the ſubject of this preſent diſquiſition.—Again, in the ſame book another paſſage was referred to, as pointing out ſome *analogy* between baptiſm, and circumciſion. This the Doctor will not allow, though *Juſtin* ſpeaks of Chriſtians receiving the *ſpiritual* circumciſion by baptiſm; but from hence he infers, " that it
" muſt

[*x*] Antipædo, p. 12.

" muſt be different from baptiſm:" which is juſt ſuch another cavil, as he made before in diſtinguiſhing between *baptiſm*, and *regeneration*. But it is plain, that, as according to *Juſtin*, regeneration was performed, or effected *inſtrumentally* by baptiſm; ſo, when he ſays of the ſpiritual circumciſion, " *we* have received it *by* bap-" tiſm," (in whatever way *others* had received it) he refers to what was done for *Chriſtians* in their baptiſm. But, for a more particular anſwer to the Doctor's exceptions, I refer the reader to Dr. *Wall* [*y*].

Says *Juſtin Martyr* [*z*], (as was alſo obſerved [*a*]) " Several perſons among us of " both ſexes, of ſixty or ſeventy years of " age, οἱ ἐκ παιδων ἐμαθητεύθησάν τῳ χριςῳ, " who were *diſcipled* to Chriſt *in*, or *from*, " their childhood, *&c.*"—Dr. *Gill* contends, it ſhould be read *inſtructed in* Chriſt: but this was ſhewn to be an improper way of ſpeaking; as it would be to ſay, that *Antiphon*, the ſon of *Sophilas*, was *inſtructed in his Father* [*b*]. The phraſe, as the Doctor thinks, might better be rendered, *inſtructed by his father*; which is indeed agreeable to the *Engliſh*, if it would ſuit the *Greek* idiom; but ſome good critics are of another opinion [*c*], and judge it more proper to

 ſay,

[*y*] Defence, p. 267. *&c.* [*z*] Apol. 2.
[*a*] Pædo-bap. p. 86. [*b*] See Pædo-bap. p. 86.
[*c*] See *Walker*'s Modeſt Plea, p. 207.

ſay, *Antiphon* was a *diſciple to* his father. *Diſcipled*, or (which is the *Doctor*'s phraſe, though of the ſame import) *proſelyted*, to his father, I think, is not ſo well expreſſed. However, I could ſee no impropriety in it, if *Sophilas* had ſet up for the head of a religious ſect; and it is only in the ſacred, or Chriſtian ſenſe, that we affix the idea of *proſelyting* to the *verb* in queſtion. Now, what we urge is this, that the perſons deſcribed by *Juſtin* muſt have been *baptized* in their childhood, or Infancy; becauſe the word, *diſcipling*, in the Chriſtian notion, includes baptiſm: for which an *authority* was produced, that Dr. *Gill* cannot well object againſt, *viz*, his own [*d*]. Nor doth he yet retract what he ſaid; only, he tells us, what his *meaning* was, which was *clear* enough before, as expreſſed in his *comment*; but, leaving him to *enjoy his own ſenſe*, we accept of his conceſſion, that the word, *diſcipling*, includes *baptiſm*. And this notion was confirmed by *Acts* xiv. 21. But *here* the Doctor would have the word, *diſcipling*, to ſignify only an *effect* (not an act) wherein, I fancy, he is very ſingular. And yet, if he would honeſtly tell us, what that effect was, (provided he may enjoy his own ſenſe) he would undoubtedly ſay, it included baptiſm; which is the thing we contend for. This conſtruction of the word was further

[*d*] His Commentary on *Acts* xix. 1. 3.

further ſupported by *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20 [*e*]. "Go ye, therefore, and *diſciple* all nations, "*&c.*" where the word, *diſciple*, is manifeſtly a *general* term, which includes *baptizing*, as well as teaching. But of this, the Doctor takes no notice, nor makes any attempt, to juſtify his former *criticiſms* on the text [*f*]. Admit then the notion, we advance, is juſt; the perſons, abovementioned, muſt have been baptized in their infancy, as they were diſcipled to Chriſt *in*, or *from*, their childhood: for, as was obſerved [*g*], baptiſm not being a *continued*, but a *tranſient* act, to ſay they were *baptized* from their infancy, would be improper; as Dr. *Wall* had hinted before [*h*]. But, Dr *Gill* (p. 14.) would turn this off with a laugh, by ſaying, this "reaſon—is merry "indeed; when *Juſtin* is not ſpeaking of "the baptiſm of any perſon at all." However, he muſt not think, to eſcape thus; for, if baptiſm is included in the notion of *diſcipling*, (which the Doctor cannot deny without contradicting himſelf) when *Juſtin* ſpeaks of certain perſons being *diſcipled* to Chriſt, he muſt conſequently ſpeak of their *baptiſm*. Therefore he muſt *give* us, or we ſhall *take* leave, to conclude, that "in "the paſſages of *Juſtin* quoted, if there is "no

[*e*] Pædo bap. p. 89.
[*f*] Divine Right of Inf-bap. examined, p. 79.
[*g*] Pædo bap. 87, 88. [*h*] Defence, p. 280.

" no expreſs mention of Infant-baptiſm;
" yet there is a *hint* given of it, and ſome *re-*
" *ference* unto it;" contrary to what the Doctor aſſerts. —— But he would willingly warp himſelf off, by ſuggeſting, that *Juſtin* uſed the word, *diſcipling*, in a *different* ſenſe from the ſcripture notion of the thing. " From whom (ſays he p. 13.) can we bet-
" ter learn his meaning than from him-
" ſelf?" and complains of his *opponent*, that he takes no notice of ſeveral paſſages in *Juſtin*, which the *Doctor* had alledged, to *confirm* his *new* ſenſe of the word under conſideration. Therefore, to eaſe him of his complaint, we will now examine all thoſe paſſages, and ſhew, that the *Greek* word for *diſcipling*, admits the ſenſe, contended for, there alſo. Let us begin with that paſſage [*i*] where *Juſtin* ſpeaks, (as it is cited and expreſſed by the Doctor [*k*]) " of Chriſt's
" ſending his diſciples to the *Gentiles*, who
" by them εμαθητευσαν (it ſhould be, ἐμα-
" θήτευσεν) *inſtructed* them."—Now, who does not ſee, that *Juſtin* here alludes to the words of the *commiſſion*, *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20. where, as has been ſhewed, the word, μαθητεύσατε, *diſciple*, includes *baptiſm*. Thus then, *Juſtin* ſpeaks not any peculiar dialect of his own, but the language of the *New Teſtament*; and ſo from thence *we are* to

2 *learn*

[*i*] Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 272. Colon.
[*k*] Argum. from Apoſt. Trad. p. 12.

learn his meaning, which is *this*, *viz.* that Chriſt by his diſciples, ſending to the *Gentiles*, diſcipled them. And how did they diſciple the *Gentiles*; but *by* baptiſing and *by* teaching them; according to Chriſt's direction [*l*]? —Again, in another paſſage alledged [*m*], *Juſtin* ſpeaks of perſons "being "μαθητευομεονους, *inſtructed* in the name "(perſon, or doctrine) of Chriſt, and leaving the way of error;" as the *Doctor* gives the words. But *here* alſo μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ χριϛοῦ (which is *Juſtin*'s phraſe) aptly ſignifies their being *diſcipled* to Chriſt, ſo as to be *baptized in his name*; agreeably to theſe words, *Acts* xix. 5. ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ιησοῦ, *i. e. they were baptized* in (or into) *the name of the Lord Jeſus*. This notion is confirmed by what *Juſtin* adds of their *leaving* the way of error; which implies their renouncing the *Pagan*, and *embracing* the Chriſtian religion: and when they left their old church (into which they, and their children had been *initiated* before) ſurely they would carry their children along with them. —— Once more; *Juſtin* "ſpeaks [*n*] of perſons μαθητευθηναι, "*inſtructed* into divine doctrines." So the Doctor renders the words; but methinks, *inſtructed into divine doctrines*, is an harſh expreſſion. I ſhould rather read it, *initiated* into

[*l*] See Pædo-bap. p. 89.
[*m*] Ibid. p. 258.
[*n*] Apolog. 1. p. 43.

into divine doctrines, *i. e.* the *Chriſtian religion.* And thus, *baptiſm*, the Chriſtian rite of initiation, may be referred to in *this* place, as well as in the two foregoing.—After all; "we grant, the word, *diſciple*, "has a reference to *teaching*, and inſtruc-"tion:" and that *new* converts from *heatheniſm* were (and ought to be) inſtructed firſt, before their admiſſion to baptiſm. But, this concludes nothing againſt the baptiſm of infants, nor diſproves the notion that children were (and ſhould be) baptized, "and "ſo far made diſciples to Chriſt, in *order* "to be taught; as *(Diſcipulus)* a ſcholar is "put to ſchool, that he may learn" [*o*].

We now attend the *Doctor* to the next writer in this century, *viz. Irenæus.*

Irenæus ſays [*p*] of Chriſt, "that he "came to ſave all by himſelf; all, I ſay, "that by him are *born again* unto God, in-"fants, and little children, young men, and "old men." Upon which paſſage (it was obſerved) [*q*], "the learned *Fenardentius* has "this remark, that by *the name of regene-"ration*, according to the phraſe of Chriſt, "and of his Apoſtles, he underſtands bap-"tiſm, *&c.*" Now here Dr. *Gill* is out of patience; he will not allow this *monk* (as he calls him in contempt, p. 15.) to be a man of learning; though all the proof, he gives of

[*o*] See Pædo-bap. p. 88. [*p*] Lib. 2. p. 39.
[*q*] Pædo-bap. p. 76.

of it, is, that he was a great *bigot* to a party: a *man* of *large aſſurance*, and *uncommon boldneſs*, &c. But, if this is the peculiar character of a *monk*, and the ſign of an unlearned man; one might perhaps, find more monks, and fewer ſcholars, in the world, than is imagined; yea, ſome famous Doctors themſelves might be in danger of being undubbed, and put on the hood. 'Tis preſumed, however, that Dr. *Grabe* will be allowed, to be a man of learning, and moderation: and yet, he thought the obſervation of *Feuardentius* aforeſaid, worth retaining in his edition of *Irenæus* [*r*]. Nor is it, I think, a *falſe gloſs*, as Dr. *Gill* pretends, but much truer than his own aſſertion, "that Chriſt and his Apoſtles no where "call baptiſm by the name of the new "birth;" if his meaning be, that they no where have *reference* to baptiſm, when they ſpeak of regeneration. The words of Chriſt, *Joh.* iii. 3. 5. moſt plainly, and *literally*, refer to baptiſm. Accordingly, *ſo*, we have proved, beyond all rational contradiction, *Juſtin Martyr* underſtood them: and he muſt be a man of *monkiſh* aſſurance, that can ſay, without ſome equivocation, "the paſſage in *Juſtin* before-mentioned, "falls ſhort of proving,—that in *Irenæus*'s

E "time,

[*r*] P. 161. where Dr. *Grabe* not only eſpouſes the opinion of *Feuardentius*, but confirms it, by ſome remarks of his own.

" time, it had obtained among the *antients*, " to uſe the words *regenerated*, or *regenera-* " *tion*, for *baptized*, or *baptiſm*." [*s*]—'Tis pretended (ibid) " the paſſages in *Tertullian*, " and *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, concerning " being *born in water*, and *begotten of the* " *womb of water* [*t*], are too late." But how can they *be too late*; when both theſe writers, though younger men, lived at the *ſame time* with *Irenæus?* — The *Doctor* goes on; " beſide, the one is to be interpret- " ed of the grace of God compared to wa- " ter; this is *clearly Tertullian*'s ſenſe; for, " he adds, " nor are we otherwiſe ſafe, or " ſaved, than by remaining in water, which " ſurely can never be underſtood literally of " the *water* of baptiſm." But if he had not been in too much haſte, to conſider the ſenſe, and deſign of the words, the Doctor might have *clearly* perceived his own miſ- take. For, *Tertullian* is there expreſsly treating of *water-baptiſm*, which ſome per- ſons, as he ſays, were for laying aſide [*u*]. This was the caſe of one *Quintilla*, who, as he tells us, " deſtroyed baptiſm according " to her *nature*; for he calls her a venomous " viper; and obſerves, that ſuch kind of " creatures frequent dry *unwatery* places." Then follow the words before us; " *But* " *we*

[*s*] Antipædo, p. 15. [*t*] See Pædo-bap. p. 79.
[*u*] Tertul. de baptiſmo, which book begins thus, Felix ſacramentum aquæ, *&c.*

" *we are born in the water like little fishes,* " after the example of Jesus Christ, *&c.*" Therefore, *by remaining* in the water, is plainly meant *retaining* the *salutary use* of water-baptism in the church. Accordingly *Pamelius* observes, " that these words are " to be chiefly remarked against those, who " deny the *necessity of water* in baptism." [*w*] To the same purpose says *De la Cerda* [*x*], " Observe the necessity of water in baptism " against the *Paulicians.*" This last writer refers to a parallel place [*y*], where *Tertullian* says, " There is one kind of flesh of " birds, that is, the *martyrs,* who soar to " the higher regions; another of *fishes,* that " is, those, whom the *water* of *baptism* " suffices." But there are other passages, which plainly shew, that *Tertullian* considered baptism as a kind, or *mean,* of regeneration; and so made use of *this* word to express baptism. Says he [*z*], " the law " of *baptizing* is enjoined, and the form " prescribed. *Go* (says he) *teach all nati-* " *ons, baptizing them in the name of the Fa-* " *ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* " Parallel to this law is that definition, *Ex-* " *cept a man be born of water,* and *of the* " *Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom* " *of heaven.*" And again [*a*], " Blessed

 " are

[*w*] Pamel. Not. in loc. [*x*] Not. ibid.
[*y*] De Resurrect. Carnis, Cap. 52.
[*z*] De Baptismo. [*a*] Ibid. sub fin.

" are ye whom the favour of God attends, " when you aſcend out of the moſt holy " *laver of the new birth.* [*novi natalis*]"—— Dr. *Gill* is as far wide of the truth, in ſaying, (p. 16.) " as for *Clemens* [*b*], he is " ſpeaking not of regeneration, but of the " natural generation of man, as he comes " out of his mother's womb, *&c.*" For, *Clemens* is *allegorizing*, in his way, upon the words of *Job* [*c*], *Naked came I out of my mother's womb; and naked ſhall I return.* " Not naked (ſays he) of poſſeſſions, for " *that* is a ſmall and common thing; but, " as a juſt man, he returns naked of vice, " and wickedneſs, *&c.* For this is what is " ſaid, *Unleſs ye be converted as little chil-* " *dren, pure in body*, and holy in ſoul, by " abſtaining from evil works; ſhewing that " he would have us to be ſuch, *as he begot* " *us of the womb of water.* For, *generation* " *ſucceeding to generation*, will advance us " to immortality." Now, in this *allegorical* diſcourſe, the *womb of water* plainly anſwers to the *mother's womb*; and ſo, theſe cannot ſignify one, and the ſame thing, without deſtroying the *allegory*, and loſing the whole *ſpirit* of the diſcourſe. Therefore, when *Clemens* ſpeaks of Chriſtians being *begotten*, or born, of the *womb of water*; he muſt intend ſomething elſe, than the *natural generation of man*; and what can

[*b*] Strom. lib. 4. [*c*] Job. i. 21.

can that be, but baptiſm? that generation *ſpiritual*, which ſucceeded the generation *natural*. And what muſt *that* generation be, which *ſucceeded* another; but a *regeneration?* — Beſides, there are other paſſages in *Clemens*, which may be ſeen in Dr. *Wall*, [*d*] where he ſpeaks of *baptiſm* under the notion of regeneration. Thus, *e. g.* he ſpeaks of Chriſt himſelf being *regenerated*, in diſcourſing of his *baptiſm* [*e*]. This may perhaps ſeem a very odd notion; but *Cyprian* alſo ſays [*f*], "the maſter himſelf ſubmitted to be *baptized* by his ſervant; and "he, who was to confer upon us the remiſſion of ſins, vouchſafed to be waſhed "in the *laver of regeneration.*" All which agrees with *Tertullian*'s ſaying before, "*We* "*are born in* the *water* like little fiſhes, after the example of, or conformably unto, "Jeſus Chriſt." [*g*] And in what other ſenſe could Chriſt be ſaid to be *born in the water*, or *regenerated*; but with a reference to his *baptiſm?*

It was obſerved [*h*], "a like notion *Tertullian* mentions [*i*], as maintained by the "*heathens*, no doubt long before the time of "*Irenæus.*" Upon this, ſays the *Doctor*, p. 16. "To have recourſe to *heathens*, to aſcertain the name of chriſtian baptiſm, is "monſtrous."

[*d*] Defence. Appendix, p. 7.
[*e*] Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 6 [*f*] De Bono Patientiæ.
[*g*] Secundum ἰχθῦν noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum.
[*h*] Pædo-bap. p. 79. [*i*] De baptiſmo.

" monſtrous." But, where is the wonder, if perſons, juſt converted from *Paganiſm*, did not immediately change their *language* with their religion, but ſtill retained ſome of their old terms, (if not their *tenets)* and applied them to the Chriſtian *myſteries? Prieſts*, *ſacrifices*, *altars*, &c. are words very familiar with the antient writers, when they ſpeak *e. g.* of the other Sacrament of the *Lord*'s *Supper*.—If the *Doctor* had as much of a *diſpoſition*, as he had reaſon to retract, what he ſaid about the cuſtom mentioned by *Barnabas*, of giving *milk* and *honey* to perſons juſt baptized; he would at leaſt have dropped that matter. For, as this ceremony was uſed by the antients in token of ſuch perſons being *new-born*; [*k*] it is plain, they conſidered baptiſm as a *new-birth*, and a kind, or *way* of regeneration. It is therefore perfect trifling, to inſert, " that the words *regeneration*, and *re-*" *generated*, are neither of them mentioned " by *Barnabas*;" nor can it anſwer any other end, but to diſcover, how well ſome perſons are ſkilled in the ingenious art of equivocation or evaſion. The queſtion is not, whether *Barnabas* uſeth thoſe words; but, whether in *Irenæus*'s time it had obtained among the antients to uſe them for *baptized*, and *baptiſm*. Now, if ſo much *earlier* than *Irenæus*, as the time of *Barnabas*,

[*k*] See Pædobap. p. 80.

nabas, the notion of baptiſmal regeneration obtained among the antients; does not *this* over-throw the *foundation* of the Doctor's hypotheſis? He had better ſuppoſe with *Voſſius* [*l*], that the words of *Barnabas* have no reference to the antient cuſtom aforeſaid: and ſo withdraw his former plea for the high *antiquity* of that cuſtom [*m*]; if he can prevail with himſelf to *retract* any thing. But even *this* will not help him much; ſince the ſaid cuſtom of giving *milk* and *honey* to new-baptized perſons, is mentioned by ſome of *Irenæus*'s cotemporaries, particularly, *Tertullian* [*n*], and *Clemens Alexandrinus* [*o*].

Irenæus was alſo cited for *this* paſſage [*p*], "giving the power of *regeneration unto God*, "to his diſciples, he ſaid unto them, *Go*, "*and teach all nations, baptizing them in the* "*name of the Father*, &c." [*q*]. "By which "power or commiſſion (ſays the *Doctor*, p. "16.) is meant *not* the commiſſion of bap-"tizing, *&c.*" Aſtoniſhing! he might as well ſay, with equal modeſty and truth, that *baptizing* is not in their commiſſion at all. But ſince it is a *part* of their commiſſion, it muſt be one branch of their power of regenerating perſons unto God, according to *Irenæus*.—It was alſo obſerved, [*r*] "that

[*l*] Not. in Barnab.
[*m*] Argum. from ap. trad. p. 37.
[*n*] De Corona milit. [*o*] Pædagog. lib. 1.
[*p*] Lib. 3. c. 19. [*qr*] Pædo-bap. p. 81.

" that *Irenæus* mentions by name the " *baptiſm of regeneration unto God.*" [*s*] Here the Doctor only repeats (p. 17.) Dr. *Gale*'s quibbles [*t*], which have been ſufficiently obviated before, by obſerving, that we do not take baptiſm and regeneration to be identically the ſame thing; but that, according to the ſenſe of the antients, the latter has a reference to the former, as the *way* and mean of regeneration. It is evidently thus, that *Irenæus* explains himſelf [*u*], when he expreſſes the ſame thing by the *laver of regeneration*, and *regeneration by the laver*. Says Dr. *Wall* [*w*], " Mr. *Gale* comes here " again with his quiddity; and ſays, rege- " neration, which is *by* the laver, is different " *from* the laver; not minding that the force " of his objection is equally taken off by " it's ſo accompanying the laver, as never " to be without it in the ſenſe of the an- " tients."—And yet this is one of the two places, to which Dr. *Gill* refers, as where " *Irenæus* uſes the word *regeneration* in a " different ſenſe from baptiſm:" he ſhould have ſaid, without any *reference* to baptiſm; if he would have ſpoke to the purpoſe. In the other paſſage [*x*], (where the ſenſe is obſerved to be imperfect. [*y*]) *Irenæus* hints, " that a man cannot leave the generation of " death,

2

[*s*] Lib. 1. c. 18.
[*t*] Reflections, p. 487.
[*u*] Lib. 5. cap. 15.
[*w*] Defence, 343.
[*x*] Lib. 4. cap. 51.
[*y*] Vid. Grabe in loc.

" death, but by a *new generation.*" Now, this is ſo far from contradicting the ſenſe of the word, *regeneration*, for which we contend, as that it really confirms it. For, we have here *generation ſucceeding generation*, as *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſpeaks, with an eye to Chriſtians being *begotten of the womb of water:* which, as we have ſhewed before, ſignifies *baptiſm.* And *Tertullian* [z] calls baptiſm " the bleſſed ſacrament of " water, becauſe, the ſins of our *former* " *blindneſs* being waſhed away, we are de- " livered unto *life eternal.*" Here then *we* have the *new generation*, whereby a man is delivered from the *generation of death*; as mentioned by *Irenæus.* 'Tis true; he repreſents the thing as effected by the power of God: but ſtill his account is conſiſtent with the notion of *baptiſm*, as being referred to by him. For (to mention *that* once for all) the *antients* diſtinguiſhed between the *inſtrumental* and *efficient* cauſe of regeneration; and ſo, betwixt the *material* and the *ſpiritual* part of baptiſm [a]. " *Rege-* " *neration* is *by* the water, and the ſpirit, " even as all *generation.* For *the ſpirit of* " *God moved upon the face of the deep* [b]. " And for this reaſon our Saviour was bap- " tized, not that he needed baptiſm, but

[z] De baptiſmo.
[a] Clem. Alex. Epitom. p. 802. Edit. Paris.
[b] Gen. i. 2.

" that he might ſanctify all water to the " *regenerated.* Hereby we are purified not " only in *body*, but in *ſoul*, &c.—For, *bap-* " *tiſm* is by *water*, and by *the ſpirit.*" Agreeably to this account, *Clemens Alexandrinus* repreſents Chriſtians as *pure in body*, and *holy in ſoul*, when he ſpeaks of *God*'s begetting them of the womb of water: as we have ſeen before. Now, all this confirms the notion, that in the time of *Irenæus*, it did obtain among the antients, to uſe the words *regenerated*, and *regeneration*, for *baptized*, and *baptiſm.*

But to return to the firſt quotation from *Irenæus*, upon which the chief ſtreſs is laid in the preſent controverſy. Says Dr. *Gill*, (who is as capable of ſaying very ſurprizing things, as moſt men) [*c*] " *Irenæus*— " moſt clearly uſes it (viz. the word, *regene-* " *ration)* in another ſenſe in this very paſ- " ſage; ſince he ſays, Chriſt came to ſave " all, who *by him* are born again unto God, " who are regenerated by Chriſt, and not " by baptiſm; and which is explained both " before and after by his *ſanctifying* all ſorts " of perſons, infants, little ones, young men, " and old men; which cannot be under- " ſtood of his baptizing them, for he bap- " tized none, *&c.*" Moſt admirable reaſoning! as if Chriſt might not be properly ſaid to do *that*, which is done by the virtue and

[*c*] Antipædo, p. 17.

and influence of his ordinances, and appointments! [*d*] Thus, what is done by baptiſm, may be ſaid to be done by Chriſt himſelf. As for his *ſanctifying* all ſorts of perſons, *&c. this* alſo (if, as the Doctor ſuppoſes, it relates to the ſame thing,) correſponds with the nature, and deſign of baptiſm, as a ſacred rite of *dedication*, or conſecration, to the ſervice of God; which is a proper notion of ſanctifying *perſons*, and *things*. Accordingly, the Apoſtle makes mention of Chriſt's *ſanctifying* his church by the *waſhing of water*, &c. [*e*]. And the antient chriſtian writers often ſpeak of baptiſm by the name of *ſanctification*. [*f*] But, it is the Doctor's misfortune to confound the antient, *eccleſiaſtical*, with the modern, *ſyſtematical* ſenſe of words. —— He goes on in his own way thus: "And I "ſay it again, to underſtand *Irenæus* as "ſpeaking of baptiſm, is to make him "ſpeak what is abſolutely falſe; that Chriſt "came to ſave *all*, and *only* ſuch, who are "baptized unto God, *&c.*" Well! and what if *Irenæus* was not more infallible in points of doctrine than the reſt of his *brethren*, called *Fathers?* Here the good Doctor breaks forth into declamation, and expreſſes an *extraordinary* concern for the reputation

[*d*] Joh. iv. 1, 2.
[*e*] Eph. v. 26.
[*f*] See *Walker*'s Modeſt Plea, ch. 28, 29.

putation of this *good old Father* [g]. But it is no breach of charity to ſay, it is all grimace. For, why ſhould he be ſo very ſolicitous to advance the character of *Irenæus* ſo much above many other of the *good old Fathers*, who held the *neceſſity*, and *efficacy* of baptiſm to ſalvation as ſtrongly, as *Irenæus* can be ſuppoſed to do upon our hypotheſis? No, no; take my word for it, it is a zeal, a flaming, though diſguiſed zeal for his own *ſyſtem*, ſo nearly intereſted in the caſe, that has inſpired him upon this occaſion with ſuch a mighty regard for the rules of *honour*, *juſtice*, *truth*, and *charity*. (tho' taken out of that *ſphere of attraction*, I make no queſtion, but the Doctor is a very worthy Gentleman). However, he ſeems to have taken a falſe alarm, from his own miſtaking the ſenſe of *Irenæus*. He ſays, "to underſtand *Irenæus* as ſpeaking of bap-"tim, is to make him ſpeak what is abſo-"lutely falſe; that Chriſt came to ſave *all*, "and *only* ſuch, *&c.*" Now, it happens, that the *excluſive* word, *only*, is an addition of the Doctor's; who would call this, *management*, in another. And then, as for the word, *all*, it does not ſtrictly refer to *individuals*, but *to all ſorts of perſons*, (to uſe the Doctor's phraſe, p. 17.) that is, perſons of all ages, *infants*, *little ones*, *young men*, and *old men*; as *Irenæus* himſelf explains it.

[g] Antipædo, p. 18, 19.

it.—It was obſerved [*b*], that Chriſt ſpeaks the ſame kind of language, that *we* ſuppoſe *Irenæus* to ſpeak, ſo far as relates to baptiſm [*i*]. And his words plainly include *this* propoſition, "*He, that is baptized, "ſhall be ſaved.*" But this *parallel* diſpleaſes the Doctor: he calls it *mean* and *ſtupid*: a plain ſign it pricked him: but, he ſhould have ſhewed, wherein it fails; inſtead of which, he has only involved himſelf in freſh difficulties. He ſays of Chriſt's words, "they need no qualifying ſenſe; the mean- "ing is plain and eaſy; that every bap- "tized believer ſhall be ſaved, and leave "no room to ſuggeſt, that unbaptized be- "lievers ſhall not." But do not the words of Chriſt as much ſuggeſt this, as the words of *Irenæus*, according to the ſenſe, we put upon them? Let the Doctor lend us his hand, to ſlip in the *excluſive* word, *(only)* here, as he did in the other caſe; and the thing is plain to be ſeen by every body. Beſides, his aſſertion, that *every baptized believer ſhall be ſaved*, (which he lays down, as the *plain* and *eaſy* meaning of our Saviour's words) muſt be underſtood with ſome *reſtriction*, by his own account. For, *Simon Magus* he gives up for loſt. And yet was he a *baptized believer*; for the ſacred hiſtory ſays expreſsly [*k*], that "*Si-* "*mon*

[*b*] Pædobap. p. 83. [*i*] Mark. xvi. 16.
[*k*] Acts viii. 13.

" *mon* himſelf alſo *believed*, and was *bap-*
" *tized.*" Such inconſiſtencies will men fall into, when their prejudices, and paſſions, get the better of their reaſon! Here one might return the Doctor ſome of his fine *rhetoric*, and ſay, " what a wretched " cauſe muſt the cauſe of *Antipædo-bap-*
" *tiſm* be, which requires ſuch *managing*
" (I add ſuch *blundering* too) as this, to
" maintain it?" I ſay, what a wretched cauſe muſt this be, which is attended with ſuch a complication of ignorance, fraud, and diſſimulation?

The paſſage cited from *Clemens Alexandrinus* [*l*], where he makes mention of an *Apoſtle drawing children out of the water* [*m*], yet ſticks in the Doctor's teeth; he chews it, and criticiſes upon it, but can make nothing of it, after all, without altering the text upon his own authority. " However, (ſays
" he, p. 21.) if this inſtance is continued to
" be urged, I hope it will be allowed, that
" baptiſm in thoſe early times (he might
" have added in thoſe *warm climates*) was
" performed by immerſion." Thus, what he loſes one way, he hopes to gain in another; nor ought we to grudge him ſo ſmall an advantage after his other loſſes. Let us then compromiſe the matter with him, and allow, that Infants were not the only *ſubjects* of baptiſm; provided he will grant, that

[*l*] Pædobap. p. 76. [*m*] Pædagog. lib. 3. cap. 11.

that immerſion was not the only *mode* of baptiſm, in thoſe early times. For neither ſide can pretend to more from *this* particular inſtance. But, the Doctor ſeems to have forgot one thing, *viz.* that Chriſt made his Apoſtles *fiſhers of men* [*n*]; and why not of children? particularly thoſe under their parent's command; unleſs, when the parents were received into the chriſtian church, their children were to be of *another*, or of *no* church. Beſides, it muſt not be forgot, that *Tertullian* compares baptized perſons to *little fiſhes*; which confirms the notion that *Clemens* alludes to the *baptiſm* of children. This may ſatisfy the Doctor without his *inſiſting* upon any further account of the matter. But, "that *he* "ſhould believe, that Infant-baptiſm is here "referred to;" this, to be ſure, is more than can be expected from a man of his *temperate* brain, *cool* imagination, and *unprepoſſeſſed* mind! However, to infer from ſuch lame premiſſes, as he has laid down for the two firſt centuries, that Infant-baptiſm muſt be an *innovation*; (p. 21.) is very extraordinary. It is amazing to think, that any man of character could *propoſe* ſuch forced, and unfair conſtructions, as he has put upon many paſſages, that have occurred in the courſe of this debate. But, that he ſhould lay any *ſtreſs* on them, and pertend to

[*n*] Mat. iv. 19.

to draw a concluſion, *ſuch* a concluſion from them: this ſurpaſſes all wonder! On the other hand, let the impartial reader review the inconteſtable evidence, that has been produced, that in *Irenæus*'s time, the antients uſed the word *regeneration*, ſo as to *connote* baptiſm thereby; and his teſtimony alone is a ſufficient proof of Infant-baptiſm in that age. Beſides, the remarkable teſtimony that was bore to the univerſal, and *immemorial* practice of Infant-baptiſm, in the *Pelagian* controverſy, when a much greater number of primitive writers were extant; is ſuch a corroborating circumſtance as furniſhes us with an unanſwerable argument for it's antiquity. But if, notwithſtanding this, any one will conclude that *Infant-baptiſm* is an *innovation*; becauſe there is *no more* ſaid of it in this period: we may ſay with Dr. *Wall*[o]; "what "then will become of *Antipædo-baptiſm*, "which does not appear to have been prac- "tiſed 'till after the middle of the eleventh "century?" Proceed we now to

The third century.

"At the beginning of which *Tertullian* "lived;" according to the Doctor, p. 22. And if, as he pretends, *Tertullian* is the firſt perſon, that ever *mentioned* Infant-bap-

2 tiſm;

[o] Defence, 281.

tiſm; he muſt alſo be the firſt perſon, that ever *ſpoke againſt* it. Therefore, by the Doctor's confeſſion, there is no evidence for *Antipædo-baptiſm* in the two firſt centuries. Thus, his own argument turns againſt him. But, it does not appear, that *Tertullian* did ſo ſpeak againſt Infant-baptiſm, as *abſolutely* to oppoſe it; on the contrary, he allowed of it in caſes of neceſſity [*p*]. And though the Doctor would make nonſenſe (p. 23.) of that exceptive clauſe; "what neceſſity is there, *if it be not however neceſſary:*" the turn of expreſſion is very agreeable to *Tertullian*'s ſtile and manner. For, the like exception he makes about *Lay-men*'s adminiſtring baptiſm, which he allows of only in caſes of neceſſity [*q*]. He ſays [*r*], "If thou haſt "the right of prieſthood in thyſelf; thou "mayſt have it when (or where) it is *ne-* "*ceſſary.*" But then he alſo obſerves [*s*], "No neceſſity may be excuſed, which may "be no neceſſity." Is there not as much nonſenſe in *this*, as in the other clauſe? and does it not imply the ſame ſentiment that is *there* expreſſed, *viz.* that it is not neceſſary, except in caſes of *(real)* neceſſity.—Beſides,

G this

[*p*] See Pædobap. p. 73.

[*q*] Sufficiat ſcilicet *in neceſſitatibus*, ut utaris. *De baptiſmo.*

[*r*] Si habes jus ſacerdotis in temet ipſo, *ubi neceſſe eſt* habeas. *Exhort. ad Caſtitatem.*

[*s*] Nulla neceſſitas excuſetur, quæ poteſt non eſſe neceſſitas. *Ibidem.*

this is the *oldeſt* reading we know of; and *Rigaltius*, who firſt dropt it, is not always the happieſt critic [*t*]: but ſometimes altered the reading for the worſe. And though the *Antipædo-baptiſts catch* at his *needleſs* correction here, (for, I hope we ſhall now hear no more of the pretended *nonſenſe*, and *impertinence of the reading*) *Rigaltius* is deſerted, and the *older* reading of *Gaignæus* is preferred, not only by *Pamelius*, but others. [*u*] It is a further confirmation of the *genuineneſs* of this reading, that *Tertullian* [*w*] aſſerts the *neceſſity* of baptiſm to ſalvation, from thoſe words of Chriſt, *Except any one be born of water*, &c. [*w*]. And though he ſays, "true faith is ſecure of ſalvation," as the Doctor obſerves; (p. 24.) this does not deſtroy his other aſſertion: however difficult it may ſeem to reconcile them [*x*]; nor can the difficulty reach the caſe of Infants, unleſs the Doctor will ſuppoſe them to have *true faith*.—It was obſerved [*y*], that the words of *Tertullian*, in what he ſays of Infant-baptiſm, imply, that it was actually *practiſed* in his time. But this the Doctor denies; (p. 23.) and ſays, "*Tertullian* "*might* ſay all that he does, though as yet "not one Infant had ever been baptized, "*&c.*"

[*t*] See *Wall*'s Hiſt. P. 1. ch. 4. S. 8.
[*u*] Vid. De la Cerda in loc.
[*w*] De baptiſmo.
[*x*] See *Wall*'s Hiſt. ibid. Sect. 7.
[*y*] Pædobap. p. 71.

"*&c.*" Now, what a ſtrong imagination may poſſibly do in this caſe, I cannot ſay. One may indeed, by the help of a lively fancy, ſuppoſe, that *Tertullian* was preſent upon the ſpot, when the firſt *child*, (as well as the firſt *Virgin*, and the firſt *Widow*, converted from Paganiſm; for he adviſes the delay of baptiſm in all theſe; and, as himſelf ſays, for *equal reaſon* [z],) came to be baptized; and that he delivered his diſcourſe about baptiſm on that occaſion. This is the imaginary ſcene, which the Doctor paints before his reader's eyes, by the caſe he ſuppoſes. But, can any man of cool thought and reflection conceive, that *Tertullian* (as mad a *Montaniſt* as he became afterwards) would ſit him down to *write a book*, or in a book deliver a grave diſcourſe about a *non-entity?* a thing that was not! —Beſides, there is ſome reaſon to interpret his words of Infants of *Infidels*, though he makes no diſtinction; becauſe, he is diſcourſing of new converts from heatheniſm. And he not only ſays, that the children of believers are holy, as they are *deſigned for holineſs*; but that holineſs he explains of *baptiſm* [a]. Now, if ſuch children could not be admitted to baptiſm without previous inſtruction; where was their *prerogative*, *Tertullian* ſpeaks of, above the children of Heathens? Nor is this contradicted

[z] Non minori de cauſa. [a] De anima.

by his saying, " Men are not *born*, but " *made* christians :" [*b*] because baptism is a mean of *making* christians ; a mean of their *regeneration*, according to *Tertullian :* and thus, they are not *born*, but *born again*, or made, Christians. So, when he says, *fiant Christiani, cum Christum nosse potuerint*, &c. *let them be made Christians*, &c. his meaning plainly is, *let them be baptized.*

It was observed [*c*], that *Tertullian* does not mention Infant-baptism among the *unwritten* customs in a book, which was wrote *after* his book of *baptism*, where we have discovered plain evidence of the *practice* of baptizing Infants. From whence it is is inferred, that he looked upon Infant-baptism as a *written custom*, &c. But the Doctor's account of the matter is, (p. 24.) that " as yet no such custom had obtained, " *&c.*" agreeably enough to his own hypothesis, but contrary to fact, in our humble opinion. And perhaps his brethren will not thank him, for making the *Antipædobaptists* or Non-pædo-baptists, the authors of all those *innovations* in religion, mentioned by *Tertullian* there [*d*]; as they must be upon the Doctor's supposition : tho' at other times [*e*], these consistent writers can represent Infant-baptism as the *leading* mischievous

[*b*] Apolog. [*c*] Pædobap. p. 74.
[*d*] De Corona milit.
[*e*] D'Anvers's Treatise of Bapt. p. 211.

chievous cauſe of theſe very corruptions, and what introduced them into the Church.

Concerning *Origen*; the Doctor takes a great deal of pains, (p. 25, *&c.*) to prove what no-body denies, *viz.* that his works are *interpolated* in the *Latin* tranſlations; though the charge ſeems to be too much exaggerated [*f*]: and what is quoted from *Ruffinus*'s peroration, at the end of his tranſlation of *Origen* on the epiſtle to the *Romans*, "was not meant by him for any ſe-"rious account of what he had done in that "work; but for a jeer on St. *Jerome*, &c" as Dr. *Wall* obſerves [*g*]. So that "the "quotation from *Marſhall* [*h*], is ſtill *good* "*for ſomething*." But the Doctor having made the moſt of theſe interpolations, (and perhaps *more*, than the matter will well bear) very gravely asks, (p. 27.) "and "now, where's his *probability*, and *moral* "*certainty*, that there are *no* additions, and "interpolations in *Origen?*" *No* additions, and interpolations! But who ſaid ſo? This is groſs miſrepreſentation. The words, here referred to, were ſpoken of the particular paſſages in queſtion. And that they could be no interpolations of *Ruffinus*'s, was proved by ſeveral arguments [*i*]. (1.) "*Ruf-*"*finus* could have no temptation, or occaſi-"on,

[*f*] See *Wall*'s Defence, p. 374.
[*g*] Ibid. p. 379. [*h*] Pædobap. p. 62.
[*i*] Pædobap. p. 64, 65.

" on, to *coin* any paſſages for him to that " purpoſe, ſince it was never made any part " of *Origen*'s accuſations, that he was a- " gainſt Infant-baptiſm." [*k*] (2.) It is abſurd to ſuppoſe, and ridiculous to ſuggeſt, that *Ruffinus* would *coin* any ſuch paſſages for *Origen*, as imported that *original ſin* was the ground and reaſon of Infant-baptiſm, directly contrary to his own private opinion; as *Ruffinus* was inclined to the *Pelagians*, according to the doctor's quotation from *Voſſius* [*l*]. If then it was not *unlucky* for his hypotheſis, that he ſtarted ſuch a notion in his reader's way; he muſt be one of the *luckieſt* men alive. But, ſays he, " it is " *lucky* on my ſide, that *Voſſius* a *Pædobap-* " *tiſt* ſhould ſuggeſt, that this paſſage is in- " terpolated, *&c.*" Now here, I ſuſpect, the Doctor's good fortune fails him: for, *Voſſius* ſeems not to ſuggeſt any ſuch thing. The words, referred to (as I ſuppoſe) are theſe [*m*]; (ſpeaking of Original Sin as the ground of Infant-baptiſm) " *Origen* truly " has mentioned it, in his eighth Homily " on *Leviticus*, and he, whoſe authority " ſhould be of greater weight in *this part*, " becauſe of *Origen*'s books being interpo- " lated by *Ruffinus*." Now, if *Voſſius* ſuppoſed,

[*k*] See *Marſhall*'s Cyprian, P. 1. p. 120. Notes.

[*l*] Hiſt. Pelag. lib. 2. P. 1. Theſ. 5.

[*m*] Meminere ſane ejus Origines Homil 8. in Levit. et is, cujus, ob interpolatos a Rufino Origenis libros, major etiam hac parte eſſe debet autoritas, p. 155. 4to.

poſed, that the paſſage itſelf was an interpolation; how could he refer to it as *Origen*'s? But it is not worth one's while to contend about this point; as the private opinion of a particular perſon is of little conſequence either way. (3.) *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*, though at great difference among themſelves, perfectly agreed in giving the ſame ſenſe of *Origen* upon the point, in their *Latin* tranſlations. The Doctor ſays, (p. 26.) "the paſſage in *Jerome*'s tranſlation of *Ori-*
"*gen*'s homilies on *Luke*, ſpeaks indeed of
"the baptiſm of Infants, and the neceſſity
"of it, (he ſhould have added, *for cleanſing*
"*from original ſin)* but not a word of it's
"being a cuſtom of the church, and an
"apoſtolical tradition."—However, it ſpeaks of Infant-baptiſm as the *practice* of the church; and founds it upon the words of Chriſt, *Except any one be born of water*, &c. which is, in effect, the ſame as making it an apoſtolical tradition, or inſtitution. Therefore, *theſe parts* of the *Latin* tranſlations of *Origen* may well paſs for *genuine*, and conſequently be *admitted an evidence in any court*, fit to try *ſuch* a cauſe, and where queſtions of *fact* are determined by ſuch *moral* proof, as the nature of the caſe admits. But, if the Doctor is for proceeding by the *civil forms* of judicature in deciding the point of Infant-baptiſm; this rule will do him little ſervice upon the whole; when

it

it ſhall be remembered, that parents can *contract* for their children in *civil affairs*. —*Cyprian*, a cotemporary of *Origen*, ſpeaks the ſame language with theſe *Latin* tranſlations of his books, ſo as to ſuggeſt, that Original Sin is a *ground* of Infant-baptiſm; and if he does not expreſsly ſay, that it was a *cuſtom of the church*, or *an apoſtolical tradition*, the nature of his diſcourſe *implies*, and ſuppoſes it [*n*]. Nor had he any occaſion to *refer* to *Origen*, as *ſaying theſe things*; becauſe they were no matter of debate in his time; a plain ſign that *Origen*, as his ſenſe is given by his *Latin* tranſlators, ſpeaks the common ſentiments of that age. As little neceſſity was there for *Auſtin*, if "he "*made* a *bluſter* about Infant baptiſm being "an *apoſtolical tradition*," (though it was not the thing itſelf, but the *reaſon* of it, that came into queſtion [*o*]) to *appeal* to *Origen*'s *teſtimony of it*; and for the ſame reaſon alſo. But, how does the Doctor's *inſinuation*, (p. 28.) that there was no ſuch teſtimony in *Auſtin*'s time, agree with his former ſuggeſtion [*p*], that *Auſtin* might take up his notion (*viz.* "that Infant-bap-"tiſm was an antient and conſtant uſage of "the church, and an apoſtolical tradition) "from the *Latin* tranſlations of *Origen* by "*Jerome* and *Ruffinus*?"

2 Dr.

[*n*] See Pædobap. p. 63.
[*o*] Argum. from Ap. trad. p. 20. [*p*] Ibid. p. 26.

Dr. *Gill* having ſaid [*q*], (ſpeaking of the *Greek* of *Origen)* " that many things may " be obſerved from thence in favour of " adult-baptiſm :" ſomebody had the courage to tell him [*r*], the aſſertion was either *falſe*, or *impertinent:* the latter, if it was not meant *excluſively* of Infant-baptiſm ; and the former, if this *was* the Doctor's meaning; and he was challenged to make good his aſſertion. This was a bold ſtroke ; and if it was a little *ſmart* upon the Doctor, he ſhould make ſome allowance to the author, as a *junior,* (ſuch as the Doctor takes him to be, p. 15.) conſidering the *manners* of *youth* [*s*]*:* eſpecially as it becomes them to imitate their *ſeniors* ; and the Doctor (who by *his way of ſpeaking ſeems* to have an indiſputable claim to that character) muſt know, who is the perſon, that firſt *hectored moſt manfully* upon this occaſion, by giving out words of *defiance* [*t*]. But, the good Doctor is highly affronted, (though, as *Plato* ſays [*u*], *No man ſhould be offended at the truth)* and, as *revenge* is ſweet, he gratifies his ſpleen in ſo mean a manner, as himſelf thought ſtood in need of an apology. (p. 28.) He knows well enough, ſo much has been ſaid in this argument on

 both

[*q*] Ibid. p. 17. [*r*] Pædobap. p. 66.

[*s*] Φιλοτιμοὶ μέν εἰσι, μᾶλλον δὲ φιλόνικοι. Ariſt. Rh. lib. 2. cap. 12. [*t*] See Pædobap. p. 49.

[*u*] Τῷ γὰρ ἀληθεῖ χαλεπαίνειν οὐ θέμις. Plato de Repub. lib. 5.

both ſides the queſtion, that no one, ſenior or junior, can now write upon the ſubject with any propriety, without recurring to many *teſtimonies*, already alledged by Dr. *Wall*, and *others*. But, if by *taking quotations at ſecond hand*, (which he imputes to the writer, he is oppoſing, and *abuſing)* the Doctor means, *taking them upon truſt* altogether, without having recourſe to the *original authors*; I can aſſure him upon very good grounds, that he unhappily treſpaſſes at once upon the laws of *candour* and *truth*. Beſides, what is all this to the purpoſe of the argument; if the paſſages produced from the *antients* are truly and properly alledged? But to be ſure, the Doctor cannot be *impertinent!* However, he cannot but be *conſcious to himſelf* of one thing, *viz.* that he has repeated many things, that were ſaid before by Dr. *Gale*, and *others*. What then? ſhall we ſuppoſe, or *inſinuate*, that he has not examined with his own eyes both *Greek* originals, and *Latin* tranſlations? By no means; on the contrary, we will allow that he has read them all; and from hence he will permit us to conclude, that he has picked, and culled out the ſtrongeſt *paſſages*, he thought to his purpoſe. Now, if upon enquiry, theſe very paſſages ſhall prove *nothing* to his purpoſe; how ſimple muſt the grave Doctor look, after all theſe big words. (p. 28.) " to ſtop the mouth of this *ſwaggering*

" *gering blade*, whoever he is, I'll give him " an inſtance or two out of the *Greek* of " *Origen*, in favour of adult-baptiſm, to the " *excluſion* of Infant-baptiſm, and as mani- " feſtly againſt it."—This is doing ſomething: and if the Doctor is as good as his word; he will be the braveſt man that ever appeared upon the ſtage of this controverſy. But, though he ſays it with champion-like aſſurance; it will prove a mere flouriſh after all. He did well " not to inſiſt upon " *Origen*'s interpretation of *Mat.* xix. 14. " as not of Infants literally, but metapho- " rically." For, he muſt have read *Origen* to very little purpoſe, if he does not know, that in his *allegorizing* way *Origen* put a *double* ſenſe upon the ſcripture; and ſo, by the *allegorical*, he did not deſtroy the *literal* ſenſe. Therefore his *metaphorical* ſenſe of that text does not *deſtroy* the argument of the *Pædo-baptiſts* from thence, (as is pretended) becauſe it does not deſtroy the *literal* ſenſe, upon which their argument is founded (*w*). Beſides, it were eaſy to make *repriſals* upon the Doctor, by reminding him, that the author, on whom he would lay ſo much ſtreſs, *viz. Tertullian*, underſtands St. *Paul*'s words, (1 *Cor.* vii. 14.) *elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy*: in a different ſenſe from what the

[*w*] See Divine Oracles, p. 60. and 80.

Antipædo-baptiſts put upon it [x]. — The Doctor proceeds thus: "It is to be obſerved, "ſays *Origen*, that the four Evangeliſts "ſaying, that *John* confeſſed he came to "baptize in (it might be read, as uſual, "*with*) water, only *Mathew* adds, *unto re-* "*pentance*; teaching that he has the *profit* "of *baptiſm*, who is *baptized* of *his own* "*will* and *choice*." [y] Now here, it is acknowledged, we have a deſcription of *adult-baptiſm*, and an account of the proper qualifications for it: but not a ſingle word *excluſive* of Infant-baptiſm, or *manifeſtly againſt it* (which is the point the Doctor had to prove). For, in like terms the Apoſtle *teaches us* [z], who has the *profit* of *circumciſion*; and will the Doctor pretend that the profit of circumciſion is ſo *tied* thereby to the adult, as to exclude *Infant*-circumciſion? But he goes on, (p. 29.) "and "a little after he ſays, "the laver by the "water is a ſymbol of the purification of "the ſoul, waſhed from all the filth of wick-"edneſs; nevertheleſs, alſo of itſelf it is "the beginning and fountain of divine gifts, "becauſe of the power of the invocation "of the adorable Trinity, *to him that gives* "*up himſelf to God*;" which laſt clauſe ex-"cludes Infants, *&c.*"—Does it ſo indeed! but

[x] See Pædobap. p. 72.
[y] Orig. Comment. in Joan. p. 124. Edit. Amſt.
[z] Rom. ii. 25.

but how? juſt as the other paſſage excluded Infants; when neither *there*, nor *here*, is the leaſt ſyllable, nor ſo much as the little word, *only*, to exclude them, without ſome of the Doctor's legerdemain to ſlip it in here alſo, as he did upon a former occaſion.

If the honeſt reader is not yet convinced how much Dr. *Gill* has trifled with him, in putting him off with ſuch paſſages as theſe, after ſuch large promiſes; let him attend to the following obſervations already made by Dr. *Wall* [*a*]. "It is uſual with the Anti-"pædo-baptiſt writers, to collect a number "of theſe ſayings, concerning the neceſſity "of *faith*, &c. as there are thouſands of "them. Thoſe of the ſaid writers, who "are cautious not to diſcover the weakneſs "of their plea, pick them out of ſuch Fa-"thers, in whoſe books there is not any "mention of the caſe of Infants; and they "would have an unlearned man conclude "from them, that thoſe Fathers muſt have "thought the baptiſm of Infants impracti-"cable, becauſe they do in thoſe general ſen-"tences ſpeak of *faith*, and *repentance*, as re-"quiſite to baptiſm. Now, all ſuch arguings "are ſhewed to be inconcluſive by this one "obſervation, *viz.* That thoſe Fathers, who "were unconteſtedly *Pædo-baptiſts*, and in "whoſe time the *practice* is notoriouſly "known,

[*a*] Defence, p. 399. &c.

" known, do, when they ſpeak of baptiſm " in general, ſpeak in the *ſame language*, " and *inſiſt upon the ſame qualifications.*"— " St. *Cyprian*, who lived in the 150th year " after the Apoſtles, is now well known to " the Antipædo-baptiſts, as one maintaining " the doctrine of Pædo-baptiſm; and yet " he, when he is diſcourſing of baptiſm in " general, has ſentences concerning the ne- " ceſſity of *faith*, *repentance*, &c. to bap- " tiſm, as poſitive as can be found in any " father whatſoever. As for example, *E-* " *piſt.* 75. *Ed. Oxon.*

" Qui cum Noem. *&c.* They, who were " with *Noah* in the ark, obtained no pur- " gation or cleanſing by the water, but even " periſhed by that flood. So alſo, *whoever* " they are, that are not with Chriſt in the " church, will periſh as men out of it; un- " leſs they come with *repentance* to that " only ſalutary ſacrament of the church, *&c.*

" *Gregory Nyſſen* lived in thoſe times and " places, when and where the Antipædo- " baptiſts themſelves now do not deny, " that Infant-baptiſm was in uſe, *viz.* more " than an hundred years after St. *Cyprian.* " He mentions faith and prayer among the " things, that compleat the ſacrament of " baptiſm. *Orat. Catechet.* c. 33.

" Ευχὴ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, &c. *i. e. Prayer to* " *God, and the imploring of the heavenly* " *grace, and the water, and* faith, *are the* " *things,*

" *things, that make up the ſacrament of re-*
" *generation.* St. *Cyril*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, St.
" *Auſtin* himſelf, when they ſpeak of bap-
" tiſm in general, uſe ſayings like to theſe.
" Yet we are ſure from other places in their
" books, that they underſtood the caſe of
" Infants to be a particular, and excepted
" caſe; and that they were to be baptized,
" though they had not at preſent thoſe qua-
" lifications; but that they were by bap-
" tiſm dedicated to that religion, which
" would teach them, and which did require
" of them, theſe things, as they grew up,
" *&c.*" [*a*].

Where now are the *inſtances*, which Dr. *Gill* promiſed from the *Greek* of *Origen*, in favour of adult-baptiſm, to the *excluſion* of Infant-baptiſm *&c.?* Or, what has he yet done, to *ſtop the mouth* of the ſwaggering blade, (as he called his antagoniſt) and to take down his mettle? Here a fair opportunity offers, to rally the Doctor upon his ſuperior acquaintance with originals, and tranſlations. But, as he ſeems to think himſelf too roughly handled already, it ſhall ſuffice for the preſent to mention Dr. *Walk*'s anſwer to Dr. *Gale* upon a like occaſion [*b*]. " I have read ſo much of them,
" that I am ſure of one of theſe things;
" that either he has not read them any other
" way than by *indexes*; or elſe does not *un-*
" *derſtand*

[*a*] Defence, p. 399. &c. [*b*] Ibid. p. 335.

" *derſtand* them; or elſe againſt his con-
" ſcience faces out a ſenſe *contrary* to *what*
" *he ſees* in them."—But I muſt advertiſe the reader of a certain fallacy, which lies in this phraſe, the *Greek* of *Origen*, and in appealing to it in oppoſition to the *Latin* tranſlations of his works. If we had now thoſe *Comments* of *Origen* in *Greek*; the *Latin* tranſlations whereof, by *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*, are alledged in favour of Infant-baptiſm; (*viz.* on *Leviticus*, *Luke*, and the *Romans*) and found, that the paſſages, cited from the latter, were not in the former; this would be a ſtrong proof of their being *interpolations*. But this is not the caſe! Therefore, the Doctor's way of arguing *from* the *Greek* of *Origen*, againſt the ſaid *Latin* tranſlations, proceeds upon *this* principle, that if *Origen* did not make mention of Infant-baptiſm as an apoſtolical tradition, *e. g.* in his Comments on *Mathew* and *John*; he could not mention it in his Comments on *Leviticus*, *Luke*, and the *Romans*. A plain inconſequence! as if *Origen* muſt always ſay the ſame things in every Comment, or book, he wrote. However, Dr. *Wall* has referred [*c*], to ſome paſſages in the *Greek* of *Origen*, very agreeable to what is cited from the *Latin* tranſlations; and though the baptiſm of Infants is not there particularly and expreſsly mentioned, there ſeems to be a re-

[*c*] Ibid. Appendix, p. 11.—13.

ference to it, as a thing *neceſſary* for them; if *Origen* ſuppoſed they had an equal concern with others in *Original Sin*; and a *reſurrection*; for, he repreſents *baptiſm*, as ſtanding in connexion with theſe things. I ſhall only add one thing more, *viz.* that in ſome of the *Latin* tranſlations of *Origen*, there are as ſtrong deſcriptions of adult-baptiſm, as thoſe produced by Dr. *Gill* from the *Greek* of *Origen* [*d*]. From whence it appears, that his *tranſlators* did not conſider ſuch paſſages as *excluſive* of Infant-baptiſm; ſince they alſo mention the latter as an apoſtolical inſtitution. Therefore, for any thing the Doctor has ſaid to prove the contrary, " we have the clear teſtimony of " the great *Origen* for Infant-baptiſm, as " practiſed in his time, and that too under " the notion of an *apoſtolical tradition.*

" Of *Cyprian* the Doctor ſays, (p. 29.) " that he is the firſt pleader for it (i. e. *In-* " *fant-baptiſm)* that we know of." But he widely miſtakes, or groſsly repreſents the caſe. For, *Cyprian* was no pleader for Infant-baptiſm, *as ſuch*; nor had he any occaſion to plead for it; becauſe no body had any doubt about it, and much leſs oppoſed it: the only queſtion in debate being, (occaſioned by the doubt of *Fidus*, an *African* biſhop) Whether Infants ſhould be baptized before the eighth day, according to the time

[*d*] Vid. Origen. Homil 8. in Exod. Homil 21. in Luc.

of circumciſion [*e*]. As for the Doctor's pretence, (p. 30.) " that though Infant-bap-" tiſm now *began* to be practiſed, it appears " to be a novel-buſineſs *(and novel-buſineſs* " *it queſtionleſs was, if it then began to be* " *practiſed)* from the time of it's adminiſtra-" tion being undetermined:" the weakneſs of this argument was ſo fully expoſed; that he is in danger to expoſe himſelf by repeating it [*f*]. The Doctor further urges, that " the exceeding weakneſs of the arguments " then made uſe of for baptizing new-born " Infants, of which the preſent *Pædo-bap-*" *tiſts* muſt be aſhamed, ſhew that *Pædo-*" *baptiſm* was then in it's *infant ſtate.*" By this ſort of reaſoning one would be lead to ſuſpect that thoſe, who uſe it, are not far from their *ſecond infancy.* Why are not the *Antipædo-baptiſts* aſhamed, to confound two ſuch *different*, and diſtinct queſtions, as, Whether *new-born* infants were to be baptized? and, Whether Infants ſhould be baptized *at all?* If *Cyprian* argued weakly for the *former*; in the name of good ſenſe, what has this to do with the *latter?* Therefore, the long citation from *Cyprian*, (p. 30. —32.) is mere parade, and nothing to the purpoſe, but only as it ſerved to introduce a moſt curious remark of the Doctor's, *viz.* " Every one that compares what *Cyprian* " and his collegues ſay for Infant-baptiſm, (here

[*e*] Pædobap. p. 57. [*f*] See Pædobap. ibid.

(here he falls again into an *ignoratio elenchi*; he ſhould have ſaid, for baptizing Infants at any time under eight days old) " and " what *Tertullian* ſaid againſt it as before " related, will eaſily ſee a difference between " them, between *Tertullian*, the *Antipæ-* " *do-baptiſt*, and *Cyprian*, the *Pædo-baptiſt*; " how manly and nervous the one! how " mean, and weak the other!"—A very good jeſt! When *Cyprian* neither argued *for*, nor *Tertullian* argued *againſt* Infant-baptiſm, *abſolutely*, and as ſuch! Here I cannot but congratulate the Doctor upon the felicity of his *genius*, and the dexterity of his addreſs. Infant-baptiſm, according to him, muſt be a novelty in *Cyprian*'s time, becauſe he is the *firſt pleader for it*, that we know of! And it muſt be a novelty, or *non-entity*, in *Tertullian*'s time; becauſe he is the firſt, that was ever known to ſpeak *againſt* it! However, the Doctor doth not deny, (p. 24.) that this *ſtrong* and *nervous* reaſoner " might have ſome odd notions, " and ſingular opinions; about which he " talked wrong, and weakly:" and it is pretty plain, that he had ſome odd, and ſuperſtitious notions of *baptiſm* itſelf.—The Doctor owns at laſt, " that *no doubt* was raiſed " about Infant-baptiſm at this time:" which utterly ſpoils all, he had ſaid before, of *Cyprian*'s pleading for it. And this is a clear evidence, that the practice of baptizing Infants

was, at leaſt, a thing of ſome ſtanding in the church, and ſo did not then firſt *begin*, as is pretended. But this, ſays the Doctor, " does not prove it then to be an *antient* " cuſtom; ſince the ſame obſervation, which " may be made, would prove *Infant-com-* " *munion* to be equally the ſame."—Well: ſuppoſing *that*; what follows from it? (though, perhaps, there may not be the ſame ground, to make the obſervation of Infant-communion, if nothing relating to it was ſaid upon the carpet) The higher it can be traced; ſo much the more it makes for the *antiquity* of Infant-baptiſm; none being admitted to that ordinance, but thoſe that were baptized; as we learn from *Juſtin Martyr* [*g*]: (who ſays not, however, that *all*, who were baptized, had admittance to it). The *incidental* way of mentioning a particular inſtance of Infant-communion, in *Cyprian* [*h*], is an argument that it was not the *firſt* of the kind. And if Infant-communion itſelf was at that time a thing of ſome ſtanding; *Infant-baptiſm* could not then be a novelty: as it muſt be the older of the two.

The fourth Century.

Here the Doctor makes the Pædo-baptiſts *welcome* to the greateſt lights of the church

[*g*] Apol. 2. [*h*] Cyprian, De Lapſis.

church in this century, as vouchers for Infant-baptiſm; (he ſhould have added, as practiſed not only in *their time*, but under the notion of an *apoſtolical tradition* [*i*]) for, ſays he, (p. 33.) "they have need of them "to enlighten them in this dark affair, *&c.*" Now, this is a mere flaſh of fancy, where we have a little wit, but no argument. Beſides; he was told [*k*], (and he does not now gainſay it) that "he has in effect given "us all the reſt: for, he has not been able, "to produce one ſingle author in this "period on the other ſide of the queſtion." What a *dark affair* then muſt that be, which has no light at all on it's ſide? *but clouds inſtead, and ever during dark.* In relation to the teſtimony of *Pelagius*, that he never heard of any Chriſtian whatſoever, that denied Infant-baptiſm [*l*]: nothing further needs be ſaid upon that head, ſince *about this* the Doctor *will not contend*; which is fairly giving up the point. But he would impute it to the ignorance of *Pelagius*, without any ſhadow of proof; nor has the Doctor proved himſelf a more knowing man, by producing any ſuch inſtances; which it was his buſineſs to have done; and not content himſelf with calling *Pelagius* an *arch heretic*; as if giving him a nick-name were ſufficient to deſtroy the weight of his teſtimony:

[*i*] See Pædobap. p. 53.
[*k*] Ibid. [*l*] Ibid. p. 24, *&c.*

mony: an artifice unworthy of a dignified *Proteſtant* Divine. Says Dr. *Wall* [*m*], "if "there had ever been any *church* in any "time, or any part of the world, that de- "nied Infant-baptiſm; he (i. e. *Pelagius*) "muſt have heard of them. For he was a "learned man; and had lived in the moſt "noted churches of *Europe*, *Aſia*, and *A-* "*frica*, &c."—What a wild imagination then muſt it be, to ſuppoſe, that Infant-baptiſm was an invention of the third century!—The Doctor does what he can, (p. 34, *&c.*) to ſupport the reaſons he had alledged [*n*], to prove, that *Auſtin* muſt have heard of ſome that *denied* Infant-baptiſm. But, how poorly he acquits himſelf upon this head, any judicious reader will eaſily perceive, by comparing the critical examination of thoſe reaſons [*o*], with his lame defence of them. Therefore, to avoid prolixity, we ſhall only make here a few curſory remarks. (1.) *Tertullian* did not *contradict* or oppoſe Infant-baptiſm in the ſame *ſenſe*, as Dr. *Gill* and his friends oppoſe it: ſo that there is no arguing from the one caſe, to the other. And whatever Dr. *Wall* thought; the author, Dr. *Gill* had to do with, did not ſubſcribe to his opinion, *viz.* that neither *Auſtin*, nor *Pelagius*, had ſeen *Tertullian*'s

2

[*m*] Defence, p. 395.
[*n*] Argum. from Ap. trad. p. 24, 25.
[*o*] Pædobap. p. 27.—38.

lian's book of baptiſm [*p*]. And indeed, they might both have ſeen it, and yet have ſaid what they did: the *latter*, that he had never heard of any Chriſtian that denied Infant-baptiſm; for *Tertullian* did not *abſolutely* deny it; and the *former*, that Infant-baptiſm was *always* adminiſtered in the church, for *original ſin:* for *Tertullian*'s phraſe, *innocens ætas*, as Dr. *Gill* himſelf underſtands it, (p. 22.) imports no more than the *comparatively* innocent age of infants. (2.) In reſpect to the controverted *canon*, made in the council of *Carthage*; the Doctor had here another convincing proof, that his antagoniſt was not a mere copier of Dr. *Wall*; but, following the direction of *Photius*, pointed out a different ſenſe of the ſaid canon. And, after all his ſhuffling, he cannot obſcure, much leſs expunge, this ſelf-evident truth, that the canon relates not to infants at *large*, but to *new-born* Infants alone. Therefore, he attempts to put a *fallacy* upon his readers, by ſlipping into his *concluſion* another *term*, and ſaying, that *Auſtin* muſt know of ſome perſons that denied baptiſm to *babes*. This is pure equivocation. For, if *Auſtin* knew of ſome, that denied baptiſm to *new born* Infants, does it therefore follow, that he knew of any, that denied baptiſm to babes *indefinitely?* that is, denied *Infant-baptiſm*; which is

[*p*] Ibid. p. 69.

is the point the Doctor was to prove. (3.) It was only for *argument's* ſake, that his author *ſuppoſed*, that the perſons, who aſked the queſtion, about the *reaſon* of baptizing Infants (becauſe many of them *die young*, &c.) were *Chriſtians:* and it was the Doctor's buſineſs to have *proved* them to be Chriſtians, in order to make the inſtance *pertinent* to his purpoſe. But even *this* would not anſwer his end; for, after all, theſe perſons might be as *good friends* to *Infant-baptiſm*, as thoſe were good friends to *Infant-propagation*, who aſked the other queſtion, mentioned by St. *Auſtin* in the ſame place, for their own information, concerning the *reaſon* of thoſe Infants being *born*, that *die young*. (4.) The Doctor is here put to his *gueſſes*, and he gueſſes wrong. For, his ſuppoſition of the *Pelagians* ſaying, "that the "infants of believers unbaptized enter the "kingdom," is a flat contradiction to what St. *Auſtin* ſays of the *Pelagians* in the very paſſage referred to [*q*]. But the Doctor is loth to own himſelf in an errour; however, if he is miſtaken, he is not *aſhamed* of it, becauſe it is in good company; a pretty excuſe for being *lead aſtray*. (5.) Sparing, as he is, of his conceſſions, he is forced to acknowledge, that the words quoted by him out of *Jerome*, are ſpoken by way of *ſuppoſition*. "But then (ſays he) they ſuppoſe a "caſe

[*q*] See Pædobap. p. 23, 24.

" caſe that *had been*, &c." Well; but how does that *appear?* not merely from *Jerome*'s ſuppoſing it: and the Doctor offers no other proof of this conteſted fact, but a *critic* upon the word *noluerint*; which, after all, may import no more than a *wilfull* omiſſion in *refuſing* to get their children baptized in due time; without implying that they *denied* infant-baptiſm. But, let the meaning be as the Doctor would have it; yet ſtill, as mentioned by *Jerome*, it is not a matter of *fact*, but a bare ſuppoſition. Nevertheleſs, the Doctor ſettles his countenance, and gravely ſays, (p. 38.) " from *all* theſe *in-* " *ſtances* put together, we cannot but con- " clude, that there were ſome perſons, that " did oppoſe, and *reject* infant-baptiſm in " thoſe times!" But, if any *one* of his pretended inſtances proves any ſuch thing, I am much miſtaken. The appeal lies before the learned world [*r*], and let them judge. ——As to what he ſubjoins from Mr. *Marſhall*, concerning ſome in thoſe times that *queſtioned* it; Mr. *Marſhall* does not ſay, that there were any in thoſe times that *denied* and diſuſed it; for, he tells us, [*s*] " that the *firſt*, that ever made *head* againſt " it, or a *diviſion* in the church about it, " lived in a much later age." Nor do the words of St. *Auſtin* referred to, imply, that any perſons in his time *denied Infant-*

K *bap-*

[*r*] Ibid. p. 39. [*s*] Sermon on Inf. bap. p. 5.

baptiſm, or ſo much as *doubted* of it, but the contrary: for he ſays, that *even thoſe, who contradicted it in ſome ſort, did not doubt of it.* 'Tis true, in that diſcourſe [*t*], he ſets up a *fictitious* perſon to argue with the *Pelagians* in their own way; and then aſks them, how they would anſwer ſuch a Diſputant, but from the *Scripture:* and ſo he exhorts *them* alſo to ſubmit to Scripture authority, and not truſt to their own ſubtile *reaſonings* upon the point in queſtion. But therefore his ſaying, "*Let no one doubt*, "whether Infants are to be baptized, *&c.*" does not imply, that any one did *really doubt* of it; this was only a wiſe precaution, which *Auſtin* thought proper to uſe in a popular diſcourſe *concerning baptiſm* of *Infants againſt the Pelagians*; in order to avoid the raiſing of unneceſſary ſcruples in the minds of the people, and to prevent their *ſuſpecting* that any body did doubt of it. This is the plain and obvious ſenſe of his words; nor can we put any other conſtruction upon them, without making *Auſtin contradict* himſelf in the ſame breath.

"*Auſtin*, we allow, (ſays the Doctor) "frequently ſpeaks of infant-baptiſm as an "antient uſage of the church, and as an "apoſtolical tradition." Why did he not add here, (what he urged upon a former occaſion

[*t*] De Verb. ap. Serm. 14. Neſcio quis, &c.

caſion [*u*]) *for original ſin?*—To the Doctor's queſtion then, "What proof does he "give of it?" I anſwer; he appeals to the authority and practice of the univerſal church in all paſt ages. But, he had no occaſion to *produce teſtimonies* for Infant-baptiſm itſelf: becauſe no one ever denied it; no, not the *Pelagians* themſelves, with whom he was deeply engaged, not about the *ſubjects*, but the *end* of baptiſm, by the Doctor's own confeſſion [*w*]. The Doctor aſks again, (p. 39.) "Does he produce "any higher teſtimony than *Cyprian?*" I anſwer; for what? For infant-baptiſm itſelf, he does not produce the teſtimony of *Cyprian* at all; having no occaſion to do it, as was hinted before: but for the *reaſon* of it. So that all, which the Doctor can conclude from hence, is *this*, that the doctrine of *original ſin* was a novelty in *Cyprian*'s time: and if this doctrine gave riſe to *Infant-baptiſm* in *Cyprian*'s time, as the Doctor ſuggeſts, (though we have deplumed him of his *infallibility*) why was not the *one* as much a *novelty* as the *other?* But, he all along confounds two *different* and diſtinct queſtions: for, it is one thing to argue *for Infant-baptiſm from original ſin*; which is the caſe, which the Doctor here ſuppoſes, contrary *to fact*; and another thing to argue

[*u*] Argum. from Ap. trad. *&c.* p. 26.
[*w*] Ibid. p. 20.

gue *for original ſin from Infant-baptiſm:* which was really the ſtate of the queſtion between St. *Auſtin*, and his opponents. Thus Infant-baptiſm was a common *data*, a thing agreed on by both ſides.——The ſame obſervation may be made of *Cyprian* and his collegues: and therefore he had no occaſion to *urge* it, as an *apoſtolical tradition:* however, what he ſays about it, *implies* ſo much; as has been remarked before.—In ſhort: *Auſtin* appeals to *Cyprian*, and St. *Paul*, *Rom.* v. 18. for *one*, and the ſame thing, *viz. original ſin*, as the *reaſon* of Infant-baptiſm: for, as he underſtands that text of original ſin, ſo he refers to it as exhibiting the *ground* and reaſon of Infant-baptiſm; for, according to him, it is by *baptiſm*, that Infants are made partakers of the *grace of Chriſt* [*x*]. But, obſerve! neither was Infant-baptiſm, the *thing itſelf*, nor original ſin, as the *reaſon* of it, any matter of doubt, or debate in *Cyprian*'s time. *This* is the very thing, that St. *Auſtin* hinges upon; and from hence he draws his obſervation, "That bleſſed *Cyprian* did "not make any *new* decree; but only pre-"ſerved the *eſtabliſhed* faith of the church:" [*y*] that is, with reſpect to the *reaſon* of baptizing Infants, which *ſuppoſes* the thing itſelf.

[*x*] Ep. ad Hieronym. Ep. 28. De Verb. Apoſt. Serm. 14.

[*y*] See Pædobap. p. 42. Nam de origine peccati nulla erat quæſtio; et ideo, ex ea re, unde nulla erat quæſtio, &c. Auguſtin ibid.

itself.——Our worthy Doctor seems not to be aware, that his way of arguing will conclude too far; unless he is turned as arch a heretic as *Pelagius*. For, if the main design of St. *Austin* is to support the doctrine of original sin by the *established faith of the church*; and yet "he produces *higher* testi- "mony than *Cyprian*:" let the Doctor look to the consequence, if there is any force in his way of reasoning upon the head of *appeals*. And here the difficulty, he starts about *Austin*'s not appealing to *Origen*, and the argument he would draw from *this* circumstance, to prove that *Origen* must have been *unfairly dealt* with,—returns home upon himself. For, if any one should argue, that, because *Austin* never appeals to *Origen*, nor to any other antient writer before *Cyprian* in proof of *original sin*; therefore those writers *must have been unfairly dealt with*, and the passages *interpolated*, where they speak of original sin: What answer would the Doctor shape to this argument? Perhaps he would think it sufficient to say, *Cyprian*'s authority alone, at the head of a whole council of bishops, was of weight enough, to decide a question of this nature, without any other testimonies. And as for *Origen*, he lay under some reproach for his heterodox opinions, on which account he is censured by St. *Austin* himself [z]: and there-

[z] De Civitate Dei. lib. 2. cap. 23. lib. 21. cap. 17. &c.

therefore this good biſhop of *Hippo* might judge it improper to appeal to his *obnoxious* books for any thing at all. Now, the ſame anſwer will ſerve our turn; without further animadverting upon the Doctor's *inconſiſtency*, in *formerly* ſuppoſing, that *Auſtin* might take up his notion that Infant-baptiſm was an apoſtolical tradition, from the *Latin* tranſlations of *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*; and *now* ſuggeſting, that the paſſages in *Origen* relating to this point are *interpolated* ſince the time of St. *Auſtin*. Thus the Doctor founders himſelf, and his argument at once.

The pretence, "that there is equally as "*full*, and as *early* evidence of apoſtolic "tradition for *Infant-communion*, &c." was ſhewn to be without foundation [*a*]: a little further wants to be ſaid upon that point, as the Doctor has yet *ſtated* the *caſe*; and it was only to the ſtate of the caſe, as he had put it, that the reply was made.

(1.) As to *infant-communion*: "it was, "(as the Doctor ſays p. 40.) in uſe beyond "all contradiction," in *Cyprian*'s time; but ſuch clear evidence has been produced, that Infant-baptiſm was practiſed *before Cyprian*'s time, as that none can reject it, but thoſe, who have a peculiar faculty of denying things *plain* and *viſible*.—If St. *Auſtin* argues for Infant-communion from the Scripture, as the rule and ſtandard of the *Chriſtian*,

[*a*] Pædobap. p. 47.—53.

tian, and *catholick* faith; he does not teſtify of it, as he does of infant-baptiſm, that it was the *antient* and *univerſal* practice of the Chriſtian church. Whether the *Punici Chriſtiani* be the chriſtians of *Carthage*, or of *Africa*; *Auſtin* ſays not (as he was repreſented by the Doctor) that *they took* it to be an antient apoſtolic tradition: nor does he *poſitively* ſay, that Infant-communion (if that was the thing intended, and not the particular *mode* of *ſpeech* uſed concerning the *Euchariſt*) *was* ſuch a tradition; but only *ſuppoſed* it; which, as every one muſt perceive, is a more *cautious* and reſerved way of ſpeaking, than he uſes, when he ſpeaks of infant-baptiſm under that notion [*b*].

(2.) The *other particulars were* taken notice of in the groſs, as mentioned by St. *Baſil*, under the notion of *unwritten* traditions. But it was obſerved [*c*], that Infant-baptiſm is not ranked in that number; and conſequently, the antients looked upon it as having a better foundation in the *Scripture*, than any of thoſe other *Rites*. Now here the Doctor rejoyns, (p. 41.) "neither "are infant-communion, ſponſors at bap- "tiſm, exorciſm in it, and giving milk and "honey at that time, mentioned by *Baſil* "among them, *&c.*"—To which the reply is, (1.) As to *Infant-communion*, the objecti-

on

[*b*] Pædobap. p. 47.—49.
[*c*] Ibid. p. 51.

on was allowed, and conſidered [*d*]. (2.) *Sponſors at baptiſm*, in one ſhape or other, being a natural *circumſtance* of Infant-baptiſm, are preſumed to be an apoſtolical appointment, conformably to the practice of the Jewiſh church in the like caſe [*e*]. Theſe ſponſors, among other things, *gave names* to children [*f*]; a cuſtom transferred from the Jewiſh to the Chriſtian church. (3.) Forms of *exorciſm* are as antient as the Apoſtles tim.; but *exorciſm* in *baptiſm* is not called an *apoſtolic tradition*, nor an *unwritten* tradition by *Auſtin*, to whom the Doctor refers [*g*]. He ſpeaks of it indeed, as an *antient tradition*; and might properly enough appeal to it for the *general ſenſe* of the church; but he does not urge it as of *apoſtolical authority*; ſo far as yet appears. The ſame remark may be made on the paſſages cited from the other antient writers, mentioned by the Doctor. (4.) If *Baſil* does not, yet (which is the ſame thing in this argument) *Tertullian* does mention the *giving*

[*d*] Pædobap. p. 52.

[*e*] — Minorum vero nomine idem ipſum profitebatur præfectura ipſa, uti in Chriſtianiſmo *ſuſceptores* minorennium, ſeu parvulorum, &c. *Selden de Synedriis, &c. lib.* 1. *cap.* 3.

[*f*] Luk. i. 59. &c. ii. 21. a like cuſtom obtained among the antient *Perſians*, of giving names to their children at baptiſm. Hyde Relig. Vet. Perſ. cap. 28. Other nations alſo made a ceremony of impoſing names. Vid. Ariſtoph. Aves. Polyæn. Stratagem. lib. 6. cap. 1. S. 6. Lucian. Contemplantes, &c.

[*g*] Argument from Apoſt. trad. p. 32.

giving milk and honey to the baptized perſons among the *unwritten* cuſtoms and traditions [*b*].

(3.) It was obſerved [*i*], that, "it does "not appear, that the *unwritten* traditions "were ever put to the ſame *teſt* of their "Apoſtolical authority, as Infant-baptiſm "was, and ſtood the trial as it did." By which was obviouſly meant, it's obtaining the *ſtrongeſt* and moſt *expreſs teſtimony* of it's *immemorial*, and univerſal uſe in the Chriſtian church, even from thoſe very perſons, that were urged with an argument from it. Therefore, there is little force in the obſervation, that the *Pelagians* were alſo preſſed with an argument from the *exorciſms*, and *exſufflations* uſed in baptiſm. For, as theſe are not called *apoſtolical traditions*, (which was noted before) ſo there is no evidence produced, that the *Pelagians* bore the ſame *teſtimony* in favour of them, as they did of Infant-baptiſm. What the Doctor ſays there about any particular rite, ſtanding the teſt of all ages, in reſpect of *continued uſe*, is not to the purpoſe; unleſs it were attended with a declaration of it's *apoſtolic authority*; which is not the caſe.

"Upon the whole then it is clear, there "is no *expreſs mention* of *Antipædo-baptiſm* in "the *two firſt* centuries, no nor any *plain* "*hint* of it, nor any *manifeſt reference* to

 "it;

[*b*] De Corona Militis. [*i*] Pædobap. p. 14.

" it ; and that there is no evidence of it's " being *practiſed* in the *third*, or in the " *fourth* century, *&c.*" On the other ſide, we have traced up the acknowledged *grounds* of *Pædo-baptiſm* to the times of the Apoſtles. In the next age we read of Infants (conſtructively) *made diſciples* to Chriſt, and *regenerated*, that is by baptiſm. In the *third* century that Infant-baptiſm was *practiſed*, and *prevailed* in the *fourth*, is confeſſed by it's greateſt oppoſers. *And ſo reſts the ſtate of the controverſy.*

The Public will now judge, what ground Dr. *Gill* had for his candid inſinuation, (p. 3.) that the *nameleſs* author, or *anonymous* writer, with whom he is engaged, was aſhamed of his *cauſe*, or *Name*, becauſe he appeared under that character; as ſome Writers on his own ſide have had the modeſty, or prudence to do, without blame or cenſure. And perhaps it may occaſion ſome ſpeculation, that the Doctor *likewiſe* was not an anonymous Writer upon this ſubject, either on his own account, or for the ſake of his friends; many of whom may be ſo much influenced by the authority of his *name*, as implicitly to believe any thing he ſays, how remote ſoever from truth, and fact. It ſhould ſeem, that he himſelf hath no great confidence in his argument, though he endeavours to put a good face on't; ſince he hints

hints ſo often at the *uncertainty* of *tradition*: as if he wanted to *ſecure his retreat*, in caſe of any diſaſter. But the inſtance he refers to, *viz.* the obſervation of *Eaſter*, is not parallel. For, if two *contrary* traditions were pleaded in *that* caſe, (which might affect the credit of both) no ſuch thing can be pretended in *this* caſe; as *one* uniform tradition carries it for *Pædo-baptiſm*; and not a ſingle teſtimony can be produced from the antient writers in favour of a tradition for *Antipædo-baptiſm*, *Originals*, or *tranſlations*. Therefore, upon a fair ſumming up of the *hiſtorical* evidence, it appears, that not Pædo-baptiſm, but Antipædo-baptiſm is an innovation.

Hæc Hactenus.

F I N I S.

BOOKS Printed for *J. WAUGH*, at the TURK'S-HEAD, in *Lombard-Street*.

A Diſſent from the Church of *England* fully juſtified: And proved the genuine and juſt Conſequence of the Allegiance due to Chriſt, the only Lawgiver in the Church. Being the diſſenting Gentleman's three Letters and Poſtſcript, in Anſwer to Mr. *John White*'s on that Subject. Pr. 2s. 6d.

The Baptiſm of Infants, a reaſonable Service; founded upon Scripture, and undoubted Apoſtolic Tradition: In which its moral Purpoſes and Uſe in Religion are ſhewn. Price 8 d.

Dipping not the **only** Scriptural and Primitive Manner of Baptizing. And ſuppoſing it were, yet a ſtrict Adherence not obligatory on us. Price 6 d.

Pædo-baptiſm: Or, a Defence of Infant-baptiſm in Point of Antiquity. Againſt the Exceptions of Dr. *John Gill*, and others. Price 1 s.